



3 1761 06930607 4

INFORMATION

NEW

ERN

RA



*Illustrated Notes
on
English Church History*

70th

THOUSAND



BP. SCORY.
COVERDALE. BP. HODGKINS.

ARCHDEACON BULLINGHAM.
BP. BARLOW. DR. PARKER.

ARCHDEACON GUEST.



CONSECRATION OF ARCHBISHOP PARKER. DECEMBER 17. 1559 (see pages 87—89).

(From a picture by the late W. Dyce, Esq., R.A.)

ILLUSTRATED NOTES
ON
ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

VOL. II.

ITS REFORMATION AND MODERN WORK.

REV. C. ARTHUR LANE

(F.R. Hist. S.; Lecturer of the Church Defence Institution).

(SEVENTIETH THOUSAND.)

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE.

LONDON:
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C. : 43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.
BRIGHTON : 129, NORTH STREET.
NEW YORK : E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.

HEcE
L

614259

4.7.55

COMPANION VOLUME,

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

300 Pages, Crown Octavo, Cloth Boards, Price One Shilling.

ILLUSTRATED NOTES ON
ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

*"FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE
DAWN OF THE REFORMATION."*

NINETIETH THOUSAND.

* * *The two volumes traverse the whole range of Church History in Britain. They contain over two hundred illustrations, including every cathedral in England and Wales, and many notable abbeys and churches.*



PREFACE

TO ORIGINAL EDITION.

In October, 1886, the writer submitted to the public a volume of 'Illustrated Notes' on the early history of British Christianity the preface to which contained a conditional promise of a supplementary series. The circulation of nearly forty thousand copies of that volume was taken as a proof that its plan and price met a felt want, and the present volume is the fulfilment of the pledge.

It is hardly needful to repeat that these 'Notes' do not claim to be an exhaustive treatment of the subject. The main plan of both volumes has been to give prominence to the concurrent history of the Church and Realm; to show that through all ages they have been indissolubly wedded; and to present the Church's ancient, mediæval, and modern history as parts of one continuous whole, with the Episcopate for its basis. Upon this continuous thread of general history a number of disconnected ecclesiastical events have been strung, bearing mainly upon questions recently raised by friends and foes alike. The history of the Anglican Church beyond the seas is outside the plan of this book, and is therefore only incidentally treated.

As the price implies, these 'Notes' are chiefly intended for Church-folk of slender means; and students must not regard them as other than stepping stones to works of higher merit. Apart from this question of cheapness it may well be doubted whether there is any necessity for treating the history of the Church of England anew; especially as there is nothing stated herein which has not been better said over and over again. Indeed it would seem that most persons who deal with this subject find it impossible to say anything fresh, or to put their thoughts in novel phrases. Certainly the present writer pretends not to any originality, either in thought or diction, and it is probable that familiar sentences may be found here and there; but there is no intentional plagiarism,

The usual ancient authorities, which are everybody's property, have been freely used ; but wherever modern summaries have been quoted, the source is duly acknowledged, and when known the price and publisher's name are added, so that those who wish to study the matter further may judge whether they can afford the luxury. Although no new light has been thrown upon a well-worn subject by these pages, they may help to diffuse the old light. Nothing has been stated which has not been generally accepted as true, or which is not useful to know ; but the grouping of certain facts, as in the chapter on the dissolution of monasteries, varies at times from the customary methods ; yet never without good reason.

These are times when many people adopt partisan ideas, and range themselves on one side or another respecting every great question that arises, and look for literature to suit their views. Even strictly impartial folk, if there are such, prefer to read what either side may have to say before they draw their own conclusions ; and they would probably consider a writer who tried to set both sides before them with a perfect balance as an insincere person, or one who had not come to a determined mind. *Audi alteram partem* is the modern motto, which implies that every assertion must be held unproven until the accused party has had the floor. This book is not intended to satisfy such people ; but rather to show how the facts of history confute the arguments of modern antagonists of the English Church. It does not seek to attack anyone, but merely attempts to restate certain truths which have been obscured by time or assailed and misrepresented by interested adversaries. Possibly no two minds would make the same selections or draw the same conclusions from the vast range of history covered herein, and whatever may be said on controverted points there are sure to be some who would prefer a different view. That these will question the wisdom of the writer's selection of events and persons is fully expected ; and lest any readers should feel aggrieved because the errors of the Church of Rome are not expressly denounced, or that insufficient credit has been given to the conscientious convictions of Nonconformists, it may be well to state at the outset that these pages do not profess to discuss opinions or theories on matters of faith ; but simply to state, and occasionally comment upon, such ascertained facts of ecclesiastical history as may help the general public to a better understanding of what is meant by the National

Church. Any book which shows how she was defended in times past will help to teach her sons and daughters how to defend her now. Party names which have come to be used as terms of opprobrium, are as far as possible avoided in the following pages; and although the writer does not pretend to look at matters from other than a Churchman's standpoint he believes that he has not dealt unfairly or inconsiderately by those who are opposed to the Church of England. These are grouped in his mind under two heads, Romanists and Liberationists, the latter being chiefly Nonconformists. When reference is made to their religious systems, it is with a view of shewing the external position occupied by the Church towards them in the past, and there is no intention of implying unkind reflections upon modern adherents of Papal or Puritan beliefs.

Extreme partisans within the Church will find nothing here to their mind. As there is no lack of common ground on which our differences may be adjusted there is no need to rush upon the keener points of controversy. If the enemies of the Church of England are to be successfully resisted, all her members must cease from internal discords; they must stand steadily and harmoniously together for her defence:

"That her fair form may stand and shine,
Make bright our days and light our dreams,
Turning to scorn with lips Divine
The falsehood of extremes."

In preparing the following pages the writer has had the very great advantage of advice from Professor Burrows of Oxford; who most kindly gave up much valuable time in reading and commenting upon the proof sheets. He has occasionally differed with the writer as to the manner in which several points are treated, but has not interfered with the construction or arrangement of the work. The responsibility for any imperfections that may be found rests solely with the writer, but he gratefully acknowledges that they are fewer than would have been the case without outside help. As both volumes have been compiled in time that was justly at the disposal of the Church Defence Institution, the writer's sincere thanks are due to that Society for allowing him to be free from lecturing engagements during their progress through the press.

September, 1888.


PREFACE.

PREFACE TO FORTIETH THOUSAND.

Most gratefully does the author acknowledge the very kind and careful annotations that have been made upon previous editions of this volume by many esteemed correspondents. It is gratifying to know that the book has found its way to the remotest regions where the Anglican Church has its outposts, and, like its predecessor, appreciated. His thanks are also due to numerous reviewers, especially those with party sympathies, for their criticisms on those portions of the book which have not coincided with certain opinions current among the schools of thought they represent. The statements traversed have now been carefully revised, and in their present form must, for good or ill, be taken as the deliberate convictions of the writer; after due consideration of the objections put forward by every critic. The issues dealt with in this volume are much too wide and varied for the writer to avoid all hostile observations; but the majority of reviews have been so favourable—the moderate and impartial organs unanimously so, while the extreme sections were exceedingly contradictory—that there have been very few changes made beyond the correction of typographical errors and the alteration of statistical tables from the latest official data.

Epiphany, 1891.





CONTENTS.

* * *The Parts and Chapters are numbered successively to follow those in the earlier volume on Pre-Reformation Times.*

PART IV.

The Church of England under the Tudors.

CHAPTER XVI. (A.D. 1384—1509).

THE ADVENT OF THE TUDOR DYNASTY.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Introductory—The Wars with France—Social Conditions of 15th Century—Wycliffe and the Lollards—Anti-papal Statutes—Council of Constance—Doctrinal Abuses—Alien Priories—The Printing Press—Wars of York and Lancaster—Increasing need for Church Reform. | 1 |

CHAPTER XVII. (A.D. 1509—1547).

HENRY VIII. AND HIS CHANCELLORS.

| | |
|---|----|
| The Oxford Reformers—Wolsey's Scheme for Church Reform—The King's Divorce—Convocation and the Seven Years' Parliament—The Royal Supremacy—Foreign Influences—Translation of the Scriptures—Doctrinal Reforms—The Reactionary Party | 21 |
|---|----|

CHAPTER XVIII. (A.D. 1536-1540).

DISSOLUTION OF THE MONASTERIES.

PAGE

| | |
|--|----|
| Pre-Norman and Post-Norman Religious Houses—The First Suppression—The Pilgrimage of Grace—The Final Suppression—The King's Vicar-General—Distribution of Monastic Estates—Monastic Churches made Cathedral—Monastic Churches made Collegiate—Monastic Churches now Parochial—Educational and Charitable Foundations | 42 |
|--|----|

CHAPTER XIX. (A.D. 1547-1558).

EDWARD VI. AND MARY.

| | |
|--|----|
| The Council of Regency—Suppression of the Chantries—The Liturgy—The Edwardian Bishops—Foreign Religious Reformers—The Succession to the Throne—The Marian Bishops—The Spanish Match—Reconciliation with Rome—The Marian Persecutions—The Exiled Reformers | 61 |
|--|----|

CHAPTER XX. (A.D. 1558-1603).

UNDER THE VIRGIN QUEEN.

| | |
|--|----|
| Restoration of the Royal Supremacy—The Restoration of the Liturgy—Consecration of Archbishop Parker—The Articles of Religion—The Council of Trent—The First English Roman Catholics—The First Puritan Nonconformists—Mary Queen of Scots—The Spanish Armada—National Glory—Summary of Part IV.—Genealogical Table | 89 |
|--|----|

PART V.

The Church of England under the Stuarts.

CHAPTER XXI. (A.D. 1603-1625).

THE GROWTH OF PURITANISM.

PAGE

| | |
|---|-----|
| The Seventeenth Century—Scotch Presbyterianism—The Hampton Court Conference—The Gunpowder Treason Plot—The Authorised Version—The Puritans—Abbott and Laud—Progress of Opposing Principles | 105 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER XXII. (A.D. 1625-1649).

KING *versus* PARLIAMENT.

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Petition of Right—Arbitrary Civil Government—Laud's Administration—The Scotch Liturgy—War with Scotland—The Long Parliament—Outbreak of the Civil War—The Long Parliament and the Clergy—The Long Parliament and the Bishops—The Westminster Assembly—The 'Independent' Army—Regicide | 123 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER XXIII. (A.D. 1649-1660).

UNDER THE COMMONWEALTH.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Proceedings of the 'Rump'—Religious Anarchy—The Quakers—Worcester Fight—Destruction of Churches—Cromwell's Parliaments—Sufferings of the Clergy—Sufferings of the Laity—Royalist Reaction... .. | 146 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER XXIV. (A.D. 1660-1685).

RESTORATION OF CHURCH AND REALM.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| The Return of the King—The Savoy Conference—The Revised Liturgy—Repressive Legislation—The Great Plague—The Fire of London—A Great Architect—The Church in Scotland—National Dread of Romanism—Popish Plots—The Church in Ireland | 161 |

CHAPTER XXV. (A.D. 1685-1691).

THE SEVEN BISHOPS.

| | |
|--|-----|
| James II. and the Puritans— <i>Non-Resistance</i> —The Declaration of Indulgence—The Bishops in the Tower—Trial of the Bishops—The Revolution—A Lost Cause—"The <i>Non-jurors</i> "—Vacillating Clergy—Genealogical Table | 179 |
|--|-----|

PART VI.

The Church of England since the Revolution.

CHAPTER XXVI. (A.D. 1688-1714).

PEACE AND POPULARITY.

| | |
|---|-----|
| The Protestant 'Sucession—The Toleration Act—Religious Societies—The S.P.C.K.—Church Work Abroad—The S.P.G.—The Scotch Church Supplanted—Queen Anne's Bounty—Impeachment of Sacheverell—Popularity of the Church—Hardships of Nonconformity—Pews in Churches | 195 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER XXVII. (A.D. 1714-1830).

THE GEORGIAN ERA.

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Silencing of Convocation—Calm in the Church—Growth of Infidelity—The Wesleys—George Whitfield—Methodism—The Evangelical Revival—Evangelical Societies—The C.M.S.—Parliamentary Grants | 211 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER XXVIII. (A.D. 1778-1888).

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

PAGE

| | |
|---|-----|
| Removal of Nonconformist Disabilities—Encroachments upon Church Privileges—Removal of Romanist Disabilities—The New Papal Hierarchy—Removal of Jewish Disabilities—The Irish Church—Removal of Atheist Disabilities—The Ecclesiastical Commission—Disestablishment—Lawsuits respecting Doctrine and Ritual—The Revival of Convocation ... | 231 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER XXIX. (A.D. 1801-1888).

MODERN CHURCH WORK.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Missionary Enterprise—The Church Revival—Religious Education of the Young—Church Restoration—Increase of the Clergy—Church Building—Mission Work among the Poor—Finance ... | 249 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER XXX. (A.D. 1784-1888).

THE EXTENSION OF THE EPISCOPATE.

| | |
|--|-----|
| The American Episcopate—The Colonial Episcopate—Home Diocesan Changes—The Diocese of Manchester—The Diocese of Truro—The Diocese of St. Albans—The Diocese of Liverpool—The Diocese of Newcastle—The Diocese of Southwell—The Diocese of Wakefield—Suffragan Bishops—The Lambeth Conferences—Conclusion .. | 268 |
| CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE ... | 287 |
| GENERAL INDEX ... | 296 |





LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.


| | PAGE |
|--|-------------------------|
| 1. Consecration of Archbishop Parker - | (<i>Frontispiece</i>) |
| 2. The Battle of Agincourt - - - | 3 |
| 3. An Armourer of the 15th Century - - - | 4 |
| 4. Portrait of John Wycliffe - - - | 6 |
| 5. Lollard Prison, Lambeth Palace - - - | 7 |
| 6. The Bridge over the Swift at Lutterworth - - - | 11 |
| 7. The Beauchamp Chantry, St. Mary's, Warwick - - - | 13 |
| 8. Interior of King's College, Cambridge - - - | 15 |
| 9. Caxton's Printing Press - - - | 17 |
| 10. Battlefield Church, near Shrewsbury - - - | 19 |
| 11. Erasmus in his Study - - - | 22 |
| 12. Portrait of Cardinal Wolsey - - - | 25 |
| 13. Leicester Abbey Ruins - - - | 26 |
| 14. North Transept of Peterboro' Cathedral - - - | 28 |
| 15. Sir Thomas More's House, Chelsea (from old engraving) - - - | 32 |
| 16. Portrait of Martin Luther - - - | 35 |
| 17. Reading the Bible in the Crypt of Old St. Paul's - - - | 38 |
| 18. Portrait of King Henry VIII - - - | 41 |
| 19. A Benedictine Nun (after Dugdale) - - - | 43 |
| 20. Ruins of Tintern Abbey - - - | 45 |
| 21. A Carthusian Monk (after Dugdale) - - - | 49 |
| 22. Portrait of Lord Thomas Cromwell - - - | 51 |
| 23. Newstead Abbey (West Front) - - - | 53 |
| 24. Nave of Chester Cathedral, looking east - - - | 55 |
| 25. Southwell Cathedral, with Ruins of Archiepiscopal Palace - - - | 57 |
| 26. Beverley Minster (Exterior) - - - | 58 |
| 27. Tewkesbury Abbey (Exterior) - - - | 59 |
| 28. Edward VI. in Council - - - | 62 |
| 29. Great Hall of Christ's Hospital (Bluecoat School) London - - - | 65 |
| 30. Portrait of Archbishop Craumer - - - | 68 |
| 31. St. Mary's Church, Cambridge (Exterior) - - - | 71 |
| 32. Examination of Princess Elizabeth by the Marian Bishops - - - | 75 |
| 33. Portrait of Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester - - - | 78 |
| 34. Portraits of Latimer and Ridley - - - | 79 |

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

xv

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 35. The Martyrs' Memorial, Oxford | 81 |
| 36. Portrait of Queen Elizabeth | 86 |
| 37. Portrait of Archbishop Parker | 88 |
| 38. The City of Trent (Panoramic View) | 92 |
| 39. The Church of Austin Friars, London, E.C. | 95 |
| 40. The Temple Church, London, E.C. | 97 |
| 41. Mary, Queen of Scots | 99 |
| 42. English and Spanish Ships (1588) | 100 |
| 43. Stratford-on-Avon Church | 102 |
| 44. Portrait of John Knox | 107 |
| 45. Kelso Abbey, Scotland | 103 |
| 46. Hampton Court Palace in the time of James I. | 110 |
| 47. Gunpowder Conspirators' House, Lambeth | 113 |
| 48. The Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster | 115 |
| 49. Puritan Costumes | 118 |
| 50. Portrait of Archbishop Laud | 121 |
| 51. Hampden House, Buckinghamshire | 126 |
| 52. The Star Chamber (Interior) | 128 |
| 53. St Giles' Church, Edinburgh (before restoration) | 130 |
| 54. Bemerton Church, near Salisbury | 136 |
| 55. Axe and Block | 140 |
| 56. A Puritan Soldier | 142 |
| 57. Carisbrook Castle | 143 |
| 58. Charles I. parting with his Children | 145 |
| 59. Puritans destroying the Cheapside Cross | 148 |
| 60. Hereford Cathedral (Exterior) | 151 |
| 61. Pontefract Church, showing Ruined Chancel | 152 |
| 62. Cromwell dissolving the 'Rump' Parliament | 155 |
| 63. Portrait of Jeremy Taylor | 157 |
| 64. John Evelyn | 159 |
| 65. The Savoy Palace | 164 |
| 66. Elstow Church, Bedfordshire | 167 |
| 67. The Plague Pits, Finsbury (1665) | 169 |
| 68. The Fire of London, as seen from Southwark | 171 |
| 69. The Monument, E.C. | 172 |
| 70. The Palace, Whitehall, <i>temp.</i> James I. | 177 |
| 71. Richard Baxter before Judge Jeffries | 180 |
| 72. Oxford Cathedral, from Merton Meadows | 182 |
| 73. A Procession by Water to the Tower of London | 185 |
| 74. The Traitors' Gate of the Tower | 186 |
| 75. Portraits of the Seven Bishops (from an old engraving) | 188 |
| 76. Magdalen College, Oxford | 190 |
| 77. Monument of the Boyne Battle | 191 |
| 78. Bray Church | 193 |
| 79. Offices of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge | 198 |
| 80. The Old East India House, 1803 | 201 |
| 81. The Old Church, Perth | 203 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 82. St. Paul's Cathedral | 207 |
| 83. Pulpit and Pew in the olden time | 211 |
| 84. Stoke Pogis Church, Buckinghamshire | 214 |
| 85. Portrait of Bishop Butler | 216 |
| 86. Olney Church, Buckinghamshire | 218 |
| 87. Epworth Church, Lincolnshire | 220 |
| 88. Portrait of John Wesley | 224 |
| 89. Statue of William Wilberforce, Westminster Abbey | 227 |
| 90. City of Rome, shewing Castle of St. Angelo | 235 |
| 91. Armagh Cathedral (Interior of Choir) | 238 |
| 92. Houses of Parliament, from the Thames | 242 |
| 93. The New Law Courts, Fleet Street | 246 |
| 94. Bishop Patteson's House and Chapel | 249 |
| 95. Portrait of Reginald Heber, first Bishop of Calcutta | 251 |
| 96. Portrait of Rev. John Keble | 253 |
| 97. An Unrestored Church (Haddon Hall) | 258 |
| 98. A recent Restoration (St. Mary, Aldermary, E.C.) | 259 |
| 99. Arms of King's College, London | 261 |
| 100. A Modern Church (St. Jude's, Kensal Green) | 262 |
| 101. A Mission Chapel | 265 |
| 102. Bishop Seabury's House, Springfield, Conn., U.S.A. . . . | 269 |
| 103. Bristol Cathedral (Exterior) | 272 |
| 104. Manchester Cathedral (Exterior) | 273 |
| 105. Truro Cathedral (from architect's drawing) | 274 |
| 106. Liverpool Pro-Cathedral | 276 |
| 107. Newcastle Cathedral (Exterior) | 278 |
| 108. Wakefield Cathedral (Interior of Nave) | 280 |
| 109. Lambeth Palace, from the River | 281 |



ILLUSTRATED NOTES ON ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

PART IV.

The Church of England under the Tudors.

CHAPTER XVI. (A.D. 1384-1509.)

THE ADVENT OF THE TUDORS.

"As thou these ashes, little brook I wilt bear
Into the Avon, Avon to the tide
Of Severn, Severn to the narrow seas,
Into main ocean they, this deed accurst
An emblem yields to friends and enemies
How the bold teacher's doctrine, sanctified
By truth, shall spread throughout the world dispersed."

—Wordsworth.

1. *Introductory.*—The following pages are intended to be read in connexion with the companion volume under the same general title, which dealt with the chief facts of Church history in our country up to the death of John Wycliffe. The five hundred years treated of herein comprise the "*Reformation and Modern Work*" of the very same ecclesiastical society whose sources, consolidation, and growth are there dwelt upon. Under the term "REFORMATION" the writer includes a vast number of adaptations and necessary changes made in the English Church during some 300 years—from the time of Wycliffe until the Revolution of 1688—some of greater, others of less importance; none of them complete in themselves, or such as altered the ancient character and organisation of that Church; but which, when judged of by their results as a whole—as a means of comparing the Church of modern with that of mediæval Britain—have made some people think that the present Church of England is a different Church to that of the olden time. We hope to satisfy the reader that in none of those three hundred years, and in no specific reign, was the old Church so altered in constitution or

teaching as to destroy its identity ; or warrant the theory that a new Church was founded, at some comparatively recent date, by reason of certain specific acts. Not only were the changes made of a very gradual character—though more rapidly successive at some times than at others—but the changes were brought about from within the Church by her recognised representatives ; and amid all she was enabled to preserve unimpaired a ‘silver line of sweet continuity’ in ministry and doctrines, which has kept her in communion and fellowship with the Apostles and with Christ. The word “Reformation” is sometimes used to comprehend all the contemporary changes on the Continent that resulted in the formation of numerous ‘Protestant’ communities ; most of which repudiate the merit of historical continuance. The space at disposal and the extensive nature of the subject demand the restriction of these ‘Notes’ to events belonging to our own nation only ; so that ‘Foreign Affairs’ will not be referred to unless they have a direct bearing on English Church history. The main object before us is to demonstrate the national, or patriotic, character of the Church ; but we shall frequently have to allude also to matters of faith and practice which were bound up with the controversies between the parties and individuals to whom the changes and events are due. Our present chapter deals with the 15th Century—an ‘Era of Preparation’ it has been called—during which the religious, social and political forces of the nation were being fitted for the great and important changes that followed. It was also, to a certain extent, an Era of Progress ; during which the relations between different classes among the people were re-adjusted for the benefit of the poorer sort. Such circumstances have an indirect bearing on the question before us, because they affected the natural development of religious questions. The Chroniclers of that Era were so busied with the temporal struggles in which England was involved that they had no inclination to study spiritual problems. What they do tell us amounts to this :—that many abuses had crept into the Church’s system ; into her doctrines, discipline, and the lives of clergy ; and that a great cry went up from all sections of the people that her house should be swept and garnished, her decayed parts removed. We will consider first, but briefly, the civil conditions of the time.

2. The Wars with France.—From about A.D. 1338 to 1453 there were constantly recurring wars with France. Our kings still ruled over certain Continental provinces, which the French were constantly endeavouring to annex, and in the preservation of which the honour of the realm was involved ; while the staple trade of the country was threatened by the desire of France to rule over certain Flemish towns which bought our wool and made our cloth. In order to meet his enemies on equal terms, Edward III. claimed to be the rightful king of France, and his descendants continued to

style themselves so until the title was relinquished by George III. The English victories at Crecy and Poitiers produced a temporary peace, but hostilities were renewed by Henry V. His campaign was distinguished by the *Battle of Azincourt* (Oct. 25, 1415) which was won by the English against tremendous odds, through the brilliant conduct of the archers; who showered their arrows among the French cavalry while the latter were hampered by the soft ground caused by heavy rain the night before. The English followed up this success by making themselves masters of the greater part of France. Subsequently, the French regained several provinces through the religious enthusiasm of *Jeanne d'Arc*, a peasant girl of Lorraine. This girl,

through treachery, was taken prisoner by the English and burnt as a witch in the Market Place of Rouen (30th May, 1431). From that time the English lost ground in France. In the reigns of Henry VIII. and his children several attempts were made to regain it, but the last French possession, Calais, was lost in A.D. 1558. The English Archbishop, Chichele, took a deep



BATTLE OF AZINCOURT.

interest in the earlier wars, and urged the king to persevere in them. No doubt the prowess of England's soldiers made foreign nations, including the papal states, fear to treat our country with impunity; but any advantage so derived was lost when the fortunes of war were reversed. Yet the loss of our French acquisitions was an indirect benefit, because it made men content to put home affairs in order.

3. Social Conditions of the 15th Century.—By the close of the 14th century relations between various classes had become greatly changed. The Norman Conquest had introduced the feudal system, by which for a time the conquered people fell into an inferior position under the barons; but they gradually recovered their rights, until the commercial policy of Edward III., and his schemes for developing the resources of the realm, created a *middle class* of persons who were chiefly engaged in manufactures, trades, and foreign commerce. For this new class and their dependents special Acts of Parliament were passed directing how each grade

should dress and what they should eat. Such outward distinctions proclaiming the rank and estate of each inhabitant, soon gave rise to the feeling expressed by John Ball in the couplet—

“ When Adam delved and Eve span
Who was then the Gentleman ? ”

The members of each class then began to combine for mutual protection, and thus the leading companies of merchants became incorporated and various handicraft guilds founded ; which, by their representative character, soon took a leading part in the direction of affairs. The warlike character of the age increased the wealth of smiths, armourers, and kindred crafts, and the numerous apprentices



AN ARMOURER.

and workmen engaged in such trades assumed all the importance that earning good wages invariably brings. So wealthy were some of the merchant companies that kings frequently accepted their hospitality, and condescended to borrow money of them on the security of their crown jewels. The growth of middle classes necessitated a readjustment of relationships between the various estates ; and a consequent loss of power on the part of the nobility. This did not take place all at once, nor until the nobility and the *villeins* had

settled their differences. The *villeins* were what we should now call yeomen, small landed proprietors and petty tenants, who, in place of rent had to render a certain proportion of labour to the great feudal landlords. During the periods of truce that alternated with campaigns in France the landlords imposed fresh hardships on their tenants and labourers ; and when the latter resisted they caused new laws to be passed in Parliament of a repressive character. This was one cause of the rebellions led by Wat Tyler and Jack Cade. Richard II. promised those who took part in the first rebellion that, if they would disperse peaceably, the condition of serfdom should be done away with, and agricultural labour paid for according to its market value. The social status of the middle classes had been gradually improving ever since the Commons were allowed representatives in Parliament ; but as labouring men were not allowed to vote in the election of the people's representatives, and were therefore left uncared for, they adopted what they thought the best way of airing their grievances, viz. : a public demonstration of ill armed and undrilled mobs ; which wantonly destroyed the possessions of the wealthy until disciplined forces caused them to

disperse. Some restrictions were placed upon the power of the kings also; as when, in the year 1404, it was agreed that they should govern by the advice of an enlarged *Privy Council*; consisting of six bishops, nine lay barons, and seven commoners. The general principles by which this levelling of all ranks was carried out were closely identified with *Lollardism*, a movement said to have originated through Wycliffe's teaching, but which was quite as much political as religious.

4. Wycliffe and the Lollards.¹—We do not desire to magnify the importance of Wycliffe, but it would be idle to ignore the fact that all through the fifteenth century his teaching was held to be directly connected with the social revolutions. That is one reason why we have made him the link that joins these volumes. It is not easy to form a just estimate of Wycliffe's opinions, because many of his writings remain unpublished. But so far as we can judge he seems to have taught that property has duties as well as rights; that unfaithful clergy ought to be prevented from enjoying the revenues of the Church; and that the government should enforce the principle. Such an idea mightily pleased the nobles, who were glad of a pretext for confiscating Church property. Hence the enmity against Wycliffe on the part of the wealthier ecclesiastics. From other writings of Wycliffe it is clear that he did not intend to preach doctrines of revolution and confiscation; but rather to explain, in the scholastic terms of his day, that clergy have a duty towards the laity, the due performance of which laymen have a right to demand. This doctrine was spread far and wide by the 'poor preachers' Wycliffe sent out. When the peasantry understood the force of the new teaching they applied it to their own circumstances by proclaiming that landlords had duties to perform towards the poor; and that, unless the nobles tried to ameliorate the condition of their dependents, their wealth also ought to be confiscated. When the nobility found that Wycliffe's teaching, which they had espoused in order to limit the power of the ecclesiastics, could be turned against themselves, they joined in the chorus of disapprobation that had come from the prelates and celibate orders; and assented in Parliament to laws proposed against the *Lollards*, as Wycliffe's followers were called. But Lollardism as a religious movement should be distinguished from political Lollardy, which Wycliffe would have been the first to discountenance. An appeal to the Scriptures was his chief policy. Any doctrine or rule of life not taught therein was discredited by him. Over and over again he taught the duty of obedience to the higher powers, even though the rulers were evil men. But while Wycliffe and his "poor priests" must be dissociated from the revolutionary movements as such, it

¹ See "Wiclif's Place in History," by Professor Barrows.—*Isis*, 3s. 6d.

must be admitted that his chief adherents were to be found among the discontented politicians; and that the religious principles of the Lollards, among whom were many earnest men of rank and high moral character, included many tenets which were and are indefensible, as for instance:—their repudiation of episcopacy, their idea that the unworthiness of ministers invalidated their official acts, and their objections to capital punishment and justifiable homicide in times of war. The Lollard movement flourished with varying fortunes all through the 15th century, but the chief points of its history can be briefly disposed of. In the year



JOHN WYCLIFFE.

1395 they petitioned Parliament to aid them in *reforming the Church*. Their petition contained a catalogue of their reasons, from which we learn that their most notable doctrinal and devotional opinions were:—

- A denial of Transubstantiation,
- Objection to celibacy among the clergy and religious orders,
- The condemnation of clergy who held temporal offices,
- Repudiation of image worship as idolatrous, and
- The non-necessity of auricular confession.

This petition exposed them to the wrath of the higher clergy, who now consisted chiefly of men nominated by the papacy, which had made these controverted doctrines essential matters of belief. Accordingly, in January, 1401, the Lollards were condemned by Convocation;¹ and Parliament was persuaded to pass the infamous statute, *De Heretico Comburendo*, by which the civil authority became the executioner of those whom the prelates condemned. In February, 1401, *William Sawtry*, a rector in the city of London, was declared heretical by Convocation, degraded from his office, handed over to the secular arm, and burnt at Smithfield. He was one of the first to suffer death in this country respecting matters of faith since the days of the emperor Diocletian. It was a deeply-laid plan on the part of the Romanizing clergy to associate their religious opponents with disturbers of the public peace; otherwise they could not have procured the passing of so cruel an act, by which the statute book was disfigured for more than 250 years. For a time the burning of Sawtry frightened the Lollards; but in 1409 Convocation found it necessary to forbid the reading of Wycliffe's

¹ *Convocation* is the legislative assembly of the Church, as Parliament is for the civil authority, and even in the most despotic times no change was made in Church doctrines or discipline without its prior consent. (See also page 73.)

writings or translations of the Scriptures. In spite of these repressive measures the new opinions spread ; and even Parliament made use of them freely, in directions which the author would have been the first to condemn. In 1404, and again in 1410, the Commons carried to extremes the dogma of Wycliffe which taught that the civil power ought to see Church revenues rightly and worthily dispensed ; for on the plea of present misappropriation they boldly proposed to confiscate the whole of Church property for the support of the king's military enterprises. The Commons also accepted in spirit the Lollard notion that the clergy were too powerful, by seeking in every way to restrict their power. It had been the practice for the clergy to arrest in their own name and confine in their



PRISON IN LAMBETH PALACE TOWER.

own prisons, all persons whom they suspected of heresy ; and it has been said that the prison in the Water Tower of Lambeth Palace was used for their detention. The Commons wished that such suspects should be arrested on the king's writ only, and confined nowhere but in the civil prisons. In these attempts the Commons were not successful, and Convocation redoubled its efforts to repress the Lollards. In return for the interest taken by Archbishop Chichele in furthering the expeditions to France that obtained the victory of Azincourt, an Act was passed (1414) by which all sheriffs and municipal officers were compelled to help the bishops repress Lollardism, by informing against and apprehending suspects ; whom

they were to deliver up to the custody of the bishops' jailors. The first layman of note to suffer death for Lollardy was *Sir John Oldcastle*, but his offence was chiefly political. He was first hanged for high treason (1417) and then burnt as an 'heretic.' We shall see presently how important the new opinions were considered in other countries. It is sufficient here to say that in spite of all attempts to suppress them in England, which appeared outwardly successful, they were still secretly cherished and propagated; and that although every effort was made to destroy Wycliffe's books a number have been preserved in manuscript to the present time. In 1449 the Commons made a further attempt to control clerical revenues by proposing to tax the clergy. Hitherto the clergy had determined of themselves, in Convocation, how much they should contribute towards the public burdens;¹ instead of being taxed in the same way as laymen. The king referred that desire of Parliament to the Convocation, and the latter, while theoretically retaining its ancient privilege, agreed to follow the example of Parliament in the proportion of their grants; and this practice continued until 1664, since which date the clergy have been taxed like other people.

5. Anti-Papal Statutes.—In our first volume we endeavoured to shew that after the 10th century Church and Realm were convertible terms for the same community, because all the members forming the nation belong theoretically to both; and that any attempt on the part of foreigners to interfere in either, was justly considered an infringement of National rights. To ignore the continued protests of Christian England against the usurped jurisdiction and doctrinal errors of the Church of Rome during the mediæval times, would be to parody the history of our country. It is true that England did not very vigorously resist papal encroachments, after the reign of Edward III., because the civil troubles kept the kings and nobles fully occupied. Still every now and then Acts appeared upon the statute book, which prove that the land was by no means prepared to surrender its ancient independence in religious affairs. The old *Statute of Provisors*,² passed in 1351, had not been very strictly carried out, and it was found needful to pass a still more stringent Act, in 1390, to prevent the bishops of Rome nominating persons to fill English benefices when vacancies should arise. In the year 1393 the usurped jurisdiction of the Pope was attacked still more effectively by a very strong defensive measure enforcing the earlier *Statutes of Præmunire*. Under this Act appellants to Rome, and officials of the papal court who landed in this country, could be severely punished and outlawed; their goods being confiscated to the State. Bishop Stubbs says that this statute is 'the clue of the events that connect the Constitutions of Clarendon

¹ See vol. I, p. 221.

² See vol. I, p. 229.

with the Reformation.' Again, in 1399, when Richard II. was deposed, it was charged against him that he had asked the Pope to confirm his acts; 'whereas,' so Parliament then declared, 'the kingdom of England and the rights of its crown had always been so free that neither the pope nor any other outside the kingdom might interfere therein.' This is the key-note of all subsequent anti-papal legislation. In spite of these acts Pope Martin V. succeeded in placing thirteen of his own nominees in English bishoprics during the years 1417-18, and even appointed his nephew, a boy of 14 years old, to the archdeaconry of Canterbury. The evil grew so rapidly that an embassy was sent to Martin V. to make him acquainted with English law; whereupon the pope commanded the archbishops of Canterbury and York that they should disregard the famous statutes referred to. Chichele was archbishop of Canterbury at the time, and he meekly excused himself on the ground that no other English bishop would allow foreigners to be promoted. Indeed, there was a special statute (1 Hen. V., c. 7) forbidding foreigners to accept English benefices. Martin V. rejoined with a long series of threats if Chichele would not try to procure the abolition of the statutes. He wrote in a similar strain to the king and Parliament, demanding the repeal of the Statute of *Præmunire*. But the statutes remained untouched all through the reign of Henry V. Some years later, and during the minority of Henry VI., Pope Martin again endeavoured to procure their repeal. This time he so terrorised the English prelates that they went in a body to Parliament, and asked that his request might be granted. But the Commons retorted by a petition to the Crown that English ecclesiastical liberty might be maintained against the encroachments of the pope. Angered exceedingly by such resistance, Martin V. proceeded to more extreme measures. He issued bulls¹ suspending Archbishop Chichele and excommunicating all the English Bishops. This high-handed proceeding was promptly withstood. As soon as the documents arrived in England they were seized by the Lord Protector and destroyed unopened; and Archbishop Chichele appealed to a General Council of the whole Church against the pope's action. This occurred in 1426. Martin V. was succeeded by Eugenius IV., who, in 1428, proceeded to a still more unprecedented invasion of English Church liberties, by giving the bishopric of Ely to the archbishop of Rouen; that he might hold that see along with his archbishopric without residing in England at all. As the prelates in Convocation were unanimous in their indignant repudiation of this flagrant act, a compromise was effected; which did not, however, prevent the revenues of the see from being collected and sent out of the country to the archbishop of Rouen. So conscious was Parliament of the importance to the country of royal supremacy that an attempt was

1 *Bulls* were papal decrees, so called from the *bullo*, or seal attached to them.

made while Chichele was primate to bring the English ecclesiastical Courts within the provision of the *Præmunire* statute; but he was able to preserve their independence by explaining to the satisfaction of the king that it was only the papal courts of appeal beyond the sea which were aimed at therein. This episode is useful as showing that the English archbishop (A.D. 1441) perfectly understood the traditions of his primacy. Resistance to the papal decrees does not in itself prove that the Church of England did not belong to the Church of Rome, any more than political agitation in our own day against laws which are thought to be oppressive allows us to suppose that the agitators have no part or membership with the nation. It is the character of the resistance that has to be considered; and the sum and substance of all opposition to papal claims from the English Church and Realm may be expressed in the single phrase, 'You have no jurisdiction here!'

6. The Council of Constance.—Meanwhile certain events of importance had been taking place abroad, in which the English Church was more or less connected. We noticed in Vol. I. (page 233) that Wycliffe took occasion to expose the scandal of rival popes. This was felt to be a great danger to Christianity throughout Europe; and a Council was held at *Pisa* to heal the divisions that were being caused thereby. This Council deposed both the rivals (A.D. 1409) and elected a new pope. Those whom the Council had condemned declined to accept its decision by retiring; so that three rival popes were in the field, each claiming absolute infallibility, who spent their time chiefly in excommunicating the adherents of the other two. This state of things was not likely to cause increased respect for papal claims in England. A more successful attempt to heal the schism was made at a later Council held at *Constance* in the year 1414, which continued its sessions until 1418. It settled the dilemma by deposing all three rivals, and electing instead the above-mentioned Martin V. This Council of Constance was convened in response to a general desire throughout Europe that the Church of which the papacy was the acknowledged chief *should be reformed*, in head and members, by remedying abuses and condemning theological errors. Its deliberations help us to understand how widely the writings of Wycliffe had spread by that time. While Anne of Bohemia was queen of England several of her countrymen were educated at Oxford. Through them Wycliffe's books had been introduced to the *University of Prague*, where they were eagerly studied by two remarkable men, *Jerome* and *John Huss*, who, having accepted Wycliffe's opinions, preached them far and wide. Huss was the most popular preacher in Bohemia, and his influence over the minds of the worst of men was very great. He condemned unsparingly the false doctrines of his time, and ceased not to teach and preach against them. When it became known that his opinions were chiefly drawn

from the condemned writings of Wycliffe, his enemies among the Bohemian clergy caused him to be cited before the prelates assembled at Constance. After long discussions that Council also condemned both Wycliffe and his writings ; and having declared Huss to be heretical, delivered him over to the secular power to be burnt.¹ This was in 1415, and in the following year Jerome of Prague was made to suffer in like manner. The Council of Constance is notable also for its decree that popes are inferior and subject to General Councils—hence the appeal of Archbishop Chichele mentioned above. This decree was confirmed by the *Council of Basle* (A.D. 1431-1449), which even went so far as to pronounce sentence of contumacy against Pope Eugenius IV., for not appearing in answer to its



THE BRIDGE OVER THE SWIFT, LUTTERWORTH (*see next page*).

citation ; and when that pontiff convoked a counter-assembly at *Florence* (1439) to maintain the ultramontane idea that popes are superior to Councils, the prelates at Basle deposed him from the papacy and elected another in his room. It is quite clear, therefore, that England was not alone in its determination to resist papal aggrandisement. The above Councils were fairly representative of Western Christendom, but the Eastern branch of the Church held

¹ See Wratislaw's life of John Huss, S.P.C.K. Home Library, 3s. 6d.

aloof; and therefore they cannot have the authority belonging to General Councils, properly so called, which should represent the Church throughout the world. The English Church sent representatives to them, and on account of the decision arrived at by the Council of Constance touching Wycliffe and his writings, a senseless act of undignified vengeance was done to his remains. In the year 1428, after he had been dead and buried 43 years, Wycliffe's bones were taken from their grave and publicly burnt. The ashes were then thrown into the river Swift that runs below the town of Lutterworth. The Swift flows into the Avon, thence to the Severn, and onwards to the sea; and although the authors of this outrage supposed that they were annihilating both the man and his doctrines, they did but add to his renown. His admirers have ever since looked upon the distribution of his ashes as emblematic of his teaching; which, in spite of modern efforts to minimise it, pointed out the way for subsequent reforms in the Church, both in England and on the Continent. The permanence of Wycliffe's teaching and influence during the 15th century has been abundantly proved. In 1476 Edward IV. ordered the University of Oxford to search for and burn all his books that could be found; and yet *Leland*, who wrote 150 years after Wycliffe's death, declared that his writings were still studied throughout Germany and Britain,' while a merchant named *Hunn* was charged in 1516 with all the 'heresy' in Wycliffe's preface to his translation of the Bible, because a copy was found in his possession. We must now briefly glance at the doctrinal and devotional abuses which necessitated such reforms.

7. Doctrinal Abuses.—One chief reason for which the Lollards were declared heretical and burnt was their denial of the doctrine called *Transubstantiation* (see Vol. 1, page 154), for which there is no authority in Scripture, nor in the practice of the primitive Church. No definite expression or decree can be found about it in the canons of the Catholic Councils; but after the Norman Conquest several Western synods and local councils assented to it, and by the 14th century it was very generally taught. Unless, therefore, the Lollards were willing to believe a doctrine so unreasonable and repellent as that the elements of bread and wine no longer remained after their consecration in the Holy Eucharist, although they were plainly seen, the 'heretic' was adjudged guilty of death. Bishop *Reginald Pecock*, by no means a friend to the Lollards, was sufficiently in advance of his episcopal brethren to declare² (1456)

1 See Pennington's *Life of Wycliffe*, S.P.C.K., 3s.

2 A curious instance of the confused opinions of the English Episcopate is seen in the fact that the temperate statements of Pecock caused him to be deposed by his fellow-bishops from his see of Chichester; and when he appealed successfully to the Bishop of Rome for reinstatement, the other English prelates, themselves nominated by the popes, prosecuted him under the *Statute of Provisors*!

that 'the clergy shall be condemned at the last day if *by clear wit* they draw not men into consent of true faith otherwise than by fire and sword and hangment.' A further error of the time in respect of Holy Communion was a belief that the whole Body of Christ, Flesh and Blood, existed in the element of bread, so that communion in both kinds was declared unnecessary; and therefore the chalice was withheld from the laity. This practice did not become general in England until after a decree made by the Council of Constance. Transubstantiation overthrows the nature of the Sacrament by destroying its outward and visible signs. The 15th century 'was an unquiet, unintellectual age, and men had been content to accept with undoubting faith theories which were put before them under



THE BEAUCHAMP CHANTRY, ST. MARY'S, WARWICK.

the reputed sanction of authorities whom they had been taught to reverence, without enquiring whether the authority itself was really trustworthy, or whether the claim to authority could be proved' (*Blunt*). Erroneous ideas had grown up respecting the condition of the departed through exaggerations of the primitive belief in the progressive amelioration of souls *after death*. The mediævalists ventured to dogmatize on what was previously felt to be very uncertain; and declared authoritatively that the purification of departed souls was through a material fire. This doctrine is called *Purgatory*. The avarice of the clergy led them to describe in horrifying terms,

and paint in vivid frescoes on church walls the torments of lost souls ; and then declare that by paying for the chanting of a given number of *Masses*,¹ living friends might lessen or end the sufferings of departed loved ones, no matter how sinful they had been. We cannot travel through England to view the ancient churches, without remarking the very large number of *Chantry Chapels* that came into existence in the 14th and 15th centuries. Chantries were usually small portions of churches in which wealthy people had set up and endowed additional altars, at which masses in propitiation for the sins of the departed were sung, independently of the ordinary Eucharist celebrated by the parish priest at the high altar. Sometimes the tomb of the dead person placed within the church formed the altar, but a separate aisle and transept, or an eastern chapel, was often added to an existing church for this purpose, which would be named after the donor, or his favourite saint. Hence the number of family chapels, filled with ancestral monuments, like the *Beauchamp Chantry* on previous page, that we so often meet with in old churches. In the early Church it was customary for the Holy Communion to form part of the service for the burial of the dead, in order that the mourners might express their belief in the Communion of Saints, living or departed. The mediæval error consisted in changing what was intended to comfort and benefit the living into a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead.² There is reason to suppose that many parochial clergy, who had been impoverished through the alienation of tithes to the monasteries, availed themselves of the additional means of livelihood thus opened out to them ; for those who died in the 15th century wars often left benefactions for the purpose. Closely connected with the exaggerated priestly power involved in the asserted efficacy of masses for the dead, was the travesty made of the doctrine of Absolution. From the beginning it had been the faith of the Church that 'God hath given power and commandment to his ministers, to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their sins ;' but since the time of the Crusades Popes had granted 'Indulgences' through the clergy to such as could afford them ; by which, on payment of money or taking part in papal enterprises, the outward signs of Christian penitence were excused. In the early days of Christianity, if a repentant sinner desired absolution the Church required him to prove his penitence by making restitution for his sin where possible, or by undergoing some personal mortification before the world. By

1 The word Mass as applied to the service of Holy Communion is derived from a Latin word *missa* ("Ite, missa est") used in concluding the service ; and the book containing the form of service, for the same reason, is called the *Missal*. The term 'mass' has been wisely discontinued by our Church since its repudiation of the abuses of mediævalists. The Greek equivalent "*Liturgy*," is far preferable.

2 For a fourth century statement on the primitive doctrine of prayers for the dead, see *Enchiridion* of St. Augustine, of Hippo, chap. cx.

the novel idea of *Indulgences* he could purchase remission of his penance, and be set free from all these inconveniences. This unholy practice increased to such a degree that full pardon could be purchased, even for sins that were intended to be committed, as well as for the foulest crimes already done; and in order that the clergy should reap the full benefit from this source of gain, confession of sin to a priest was made an absolute necessity for all at stated periods. Such a parody of religion could not fail to excite indignation and distrust; and cry aloud for reformation. The impious trade in Indulgences reached its height during the papacy of Alexander VI. and Leo X., who caused them to be publicly sold at fixed rates throughout Europe, on the plea that money was required to build the famous Church of St. Peter's, at Rome.

8. Alien Priories.—Although the civil government could not take cognisance of any purely spiritual questions, there were a number of constitutional abuses in the old monastic system which violated the law and so properly came within the jurisdiction of the king. The *Alien Priories* came under this head. A priory was usually a religious house dependent upon one of the greater abbeys; although there were some independent religious houses of which the chief was called a prior or prioress. The 'alien priories' were dependent upon foreign monasteries. They grew up as the result of the Norman Conquest, when the new nobility, desiring to benefit French or Norman Abbeys in which they were in-



KING'S COLLEGE CHAPEL, CAMBRIDGE.

terested, made over to them English estates, and the revenues of churches in their patronage. Much English money was sent abroad in this way without any return being made; for the foreign abbeys made no provision for the district which benefited them save placing a few dependent monks on the property to look after the estate and remit the profits. When the French wars were in progress, the enormity of this system became more than ever apparent, because the revenues of the English priories were enriching those with whom our country was at war. Therefore, when the Commons desired to confiscate the property of the English clergy, Archbishop Chichele suggested instead that the alien priories should be suppressed. Several had been seized by Edward III., which formed a precedent, and the rest were dissolved by Act of Parliament in 1414 and their revenues granted to the king. It would have been impolitic to entirely alienate their possessions from religious purposes, and therefore, about A.D. 1440, Henry VI. founded Eton College for boys and *King's College* at Cambridge, his Queen at the same time giving her name to *Queen's College* in the same university. The rapid increase in the number of educational foundations during the 15th century was due to the growing demand for knowledge. Men were beginning to understand that "the pen is mightier than the sword," and that it would not do for laymen to ignore the advantages of education. Archbishop Chichele himself founded a college at Oxford, A.D. 1437, calling it *All Souls*, to commemorate those who had been killed in the French wars; and *Bishop Waynflete*, of Winchester, that of Magdalen, Oxford, twenty-one years later. These episcopal foundations were supported chiefly from the revenues of monasteries within the jurisdiction of those prelates which they had suppressed. As the celibate system was no longer popular, through the indiscretions of its members, benevolent persons who might otherwise have built monasteries expended their charity in founding chantries, schools and colleges. At the beginning of the 16th century *Bishop Foze* of Winchester desired to found a monastery, but was dissuaded from the idea by *Bishop Oldham* of Exeter, on the ground that conventual establishments had ceased to be good and useful, and must soon pass away. These two bishops founded instead *Corpus Christi College*, Oxford.

9. The Printing Press.—Closely connected with the subject of education was the *Invention of Printing*. No event of any century has wrought such deep and lasting influence on our national history, or done more to dispel the ignorance upon which erroneous teachers traded. Henceforth the laborious work of multiplying copies of any book by hand was at an end, to say nothing of the vast difference in cost. A single sheet of parchment or vellum written out in the old black letter style of the 14th century would be worth about two shillings at the present value of money, while a

complete copy of Wycliffe's Bible would cost at least £40. But the substitution of paper for skins in 1350, succeeded by the invention of printing, changed all this. The new art was discovered in Germany by a man named *Guttenburg* (A.D. 1440). Wooden blocks came into use two years after, and types cut from metal in 1444. The roller printing press did not come into use till 1450; nor was the invention brought to England for many years after. A native of Kent named William Caxton had learnt the trade in Holland, whence he proceeded to Ghent and there translated and published the *History of Troy*, which was the first book printed in the English tongue (1471). He came to England two years after and set up a press in the almonry at Westminster. The first book printed on English ground was the *Game and Playe of Chesse*. Most of Caxton's books were translated from French, and were in 'black letter' type, *i.e.* 'Old English' characters.

By this time the vernacular language had considerably changed, and even the earlier form of 'Middle English' in which Wycliffe and Chaucer wrote (which dates roughly from A.D. 1200 to 1450) was greatly modified. The use of Norman French in Parliament and the Law-Courts gave place to the vernacular in the time of Edward III., and English had been taught in the schools ever since. Too much stress has been laid on the late appearance of Bibles and books of devotion in English, because the demand did not very long precede the supply. Printing presses were set up



AN EARLY PRINTING PRESS.

in Oxford in 1503, after which the trade became important and lucrative. The earliest books had no title-pages, and no capital

letters; nor were the useful comma (,) and semi-colon (;) introduced. Words were often spelt phonetically, and sometimes the same word was spelt in different ways on a single page. The reign of Richard III., in many respects execrable, is remarkable for a statute which, while restricting other branches of foreign trade, expressly exempted written and printed books; and for the further fact that Acts of Parliament were then printed for the first time. So rapidly did books multiply after this that within a hundred years from Caxton's time no less than 10,000 distinct works had been issued from the press by some 350 printers; which were circulated throughout the land. Hence we know a great deal about what has happened in our country after the 15th century, and of the political and theological discussions which occupied men's minds. For the same reason it is difficult to make selections for a book like this from the innumerable important events recorded, without exciting adverse criticism for having left as many equally important ones unnoticed.

10. The Wars of York and Lancaster.—We must not overlook the importance of the internecine strife between the great English nobles, that produced such fatal revolutions during the 15th century. The deposition of Richard II. in 1399 and the coronation of Henry IV. in his stead may be looked upon as the beginning of the struggle: for in 1402 a bold attempt was made by the Percies, of Northumberland, to restore the Yorkist Family. A great battle was fought near Shrewsbury in furtherance of their plans, at which the famous '*Hotspur*' lost his life, and the Lancastrians, who upheld King Henry IV., won the day. As an act of thanksgiving the victors erected a church on the site of the struggle which has ever since been called *Battlefield Church*. The French war kept the jealous rivals from actual warfare for the next 50 years; but they kept struggling for such lucrative positions as the government of England could provide. After the French provinces were surrendered the enmity of the nobles again became openly violent. *Richard, Duke of York*, heir presumptive to the throne until the birth of an heir to Henry VI., had been made Lord Protector during the temporary insanity of that king, but when the latter recovered he was deprived of his office and replaced by his rival *Somerset*. The disgraced Duke at once appealed to arms; and the battles that ensued between the rival factions are known as the *Wars of the Roses*. The badges worn by each side caused them to be so called. The tradition recorded by Shakespear (*Hen. VI. part i, act ii. sc. 4*) accounts for the choice of a *Red Rose* by the Lancastrians, and a *White Rose* by the Yorkists. The first battle was at St. Albans, A.D. 1455. Sometimes the Yorkists won and sometimes the House of Lancaster. At Wakefield (1460) the Duke of York was killed; but his son Edward continued the struggle,

and became king in 1461. For 22 years the House of York continued to hold the throne, but not without much bloodshed. In 1485 the last great battle was fought between the parties at *Bosworth Field*, when several nobles deserted Richard III. and victory once more fell to the Red Rose. *Henry, earl of Richmond*, grandson of *Owen Tudor*, (whose mother's grandfather was a grandson of Edward III. and who was the only survivor of the Lancastrian dynasty) led the victorious army and was crowned king by the title of *Henry VII.*; thus introducing the 'Tudor Dynasty.' By his marriage with *Elizabeth of York*, daughter of Edward IV., the fortunes of the rival houses were united and the fratricidal strife concluded; but not before they had impoverished the land, destroyed the flower of English youth, and almost stamped out the old nobility.

When the noblemen assembled after the battle of Bosworth there were found to be only 29 lay barons alive. Religious life could not have free course while such faction fights were general, and therefore we do not wonder that the history of the Church in the latter half of the century was one of humiliating degeneracy. Also we must consider that the remembrance of the struggle had much to do with the very small value set upon human life in succeeding generations.



BATTLEFIELD CHURCH, SHREWSBURY.

The Wars of the Roses brought the feudal baronage to an end, and made the kings so far beyond all other noblemen in power that for some time to come their rule was absolute and despotic. Henry's title to the Crown was somewhat defective, but he strengthened his personal position by allowing the popes to govern the English Church absolutely.

11. Increasing need for Church Reform.—Henry VII. had a fairly prosperous and peaceful reign, during which the country was restored to a measure of its former prosperity. The

people began again to consider ecclesiastical affairs, and the way was steadily being shaped for the final struggle against papal jurisdiction that was bound to come. The culminating point of foreign usurpation occurred when *Cardinal Kempe* was appointed by papal provision to the see of Canterbury, and then made extraordinary legate of the pope.¹ This triple position (cardinal, primate, and papal legate) was accorded also to Kempe's successors, Bouchier and Morton. Under their rule, which extended over half a century, 1452-1502, the National character of the English Church became almost extinct; until it seemed to be a mere appanage of the papacy. During that time the papal chair was filled by men of most scandalous lives:—murderers like the Borgias, adulterers like the Medici, and infidels like Leo X.—whose avarice led them to degrade the Church and her Sacraments in return for money payments to their agents and collectors. With such superiors it is not surprising that the clergy of that day were not distinguished for integrity and virtue. In England the majority of the bishops and abbots were conspicuous for high character and scholarship; but the moral tone and intelligence of the inferior clergy will not bear examination. We have explained² that the mediæval clergy were divided into three groups:—the *Seculars*, or parish priests; the *Regulars*, belonging to the old monasteries; and the *Mendicant Friars*. These three sections lived in open and notorious rivalry, and kept up a sort of triangular duel which alone threatened to break up the Church. Among the Seculars are to be reckoned the chantry priests, who were often employed to fill undignified positions in the families for whose dead relatives they chanted Mass. Altogether the clergy of the time did not inspire the laity with any great amount of respect. The Church Courts also, which took cognisance of all offences against the moral law, sold their judgments by accepting pecuniary fines, thus becoming 'centres of corruption, which archbishops, legates, and councils tried to reform and failed, acquiescing in the failure rather than allow the intrusion of the secular power.'³ While earnest minds in England were exercised with such things, others abroad were no less so. Among them stands pre-eminent the great Florentine reformer, *Savonarola*, who unsparingly denounced abuses and demanded Church Reform. For five years (1490-95) he wielded unbounded influence over the people of Florence by singularly patriotic and judicious Christian zeal, regardless alike of threats and bribes from the shameless popes of Rome. But his zeal became fanatical and destructive, and then his influence waned. Alexander VI. caused him to be strangled and burnt in 1498. Another 15th century abuse was the growing custom of pilgrimages to the shrines of saints by the well-to-do—

¹ See Vol. I., pp. 177-8.

² Vol. I., pp. 127, 185 and 214.

³ Bishop Stubbs' Constitutional History, Vol. I., p. 373.

such as the shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury, the shrine of St. Mary at Walsingham, and the rood (crucifix) at the north door of St. Paul's Cathedral—and the adoration of images by the ignorant poor. The Lollards had rightly declared these practices to be idolatrous. Educated persons might be able to distinguish between obeisance made before such shrines and the still greater reverence due to God 'orking in and by the image'; as did Bishop Pecock wh he wrote against the Lollards that 'no man taketh for his Go and worshipeth . . . any image row in Christendom after that the man is come to years of discretion, and is past childhood, and is not a natural fool;' but the want of education among the poor made them incapable of dissociating their outward reverence to a crucifix from the higher worship due to the Being it represented, and there was the greatest danger that similar homage rendered to pictures and statues of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or to the relics and shrines of saints (who were wrongly supposed to take personal cognisance, and mediate on behalf of individual petitioners outside their sphere) would obscure the doctrine of the One Mediat between God and man.

These then were the general condition of the Church and society at the time when Henry VII. was buried in the beautiful chantry chapel he caused to be added to the eastern part of Westminster Abbey; and when his second son succeeded to the throne as Henry VIII. A.D. 1509.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE KING AND HIS CHANCELLORS.

'Henceforward, with the sovereignty transferred
Unto itself, the crown assumes a voice
Of reckless mastery hitherto unknown.'—*Worthington*

1. **The Oxford Reformers.**—The archbishop of Canterbury during the early part of the reign of Henry VIII. was *William Warham*. He occupied the position for thirty years from 1503. During his primacy Oxford University came to be the centre of a remarkable revival of ancient literature, which greatly assisted decisions upon ecclesiastical affairs that demanded reform. It had begun in Italy by researches among Pagan classics, but these soon gave place among the religiously inclined to studies in the original works of early Latin Fathers of the Church; and after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, which drove many Greek scholars westward, in the writings of the Greek Christian Fathers also. It then

became an accepted axiom that education without Greek was worthless; and just as Wycliffe's writings had been carried from Oxford to Prague, so the *New Learning*, as it was called, was transplanted from its cradle in Italy to another home at Oxford. Warham was a great patron of the movement, and he was ably seconded by *Thomas Wolsey*, then Dean of Lincoln and Royal Almoner, who took delight in seeking out and sending to Oxford for instruction such promising youths as were brought to his notice. Among them was *Thomas More*, an earnest, witty, and lovable young man who had been his page. At Oxford, More was brought under the



ERASMUS STUDYING.

influence of *John Colet*, son of a lord mayor of London, who at the time was giving far-famed lectures on the Greek Epistles of St. Paul. He also met several of Colet's friends at the University, and among them *Linacre*, who afterwards founded the Royal College of Physicians, and *Grocyn* who taught Greek. They gave their best efforts to the study of the New Testament in the original tongue, and were joined by a poor scholar, known as *Erasmus*, who became the most learned man of his day. Colet was firmly convinced of the need for Church Reform, and loudly declaimed against ecclesiastical scandals. "Keep to the Bible and the Apostles' Creed," he used to say to his scholars, "and let divines, if they like, dispute about the

rest." From this time the watchword of Church reformers in England was 'Scripture and the primitive fathers' *versus* mediæval tradition. Colet was presently made dean of St. Paul's, More became a barrister and entered Parliament, and Erasmus went abroad to study. The friends afterwards formed a literary circle in London, and were joined by others of like mind. When Henry VIII. ascended the throne, the little band of scholars was received into high favour at Court. Erasmus then became professor of Greek at Cambridge, and Colet preached 'Reform' from the pulpit of St. Paul's. The friends made up their minds to place the "New Learning" on a firm basis and provide for its continuance. Colet's father had died and left him very wealthy, but he devoted his whole fortune to the foundation of a Grammar School close to his cathedral, where boys might be instructed in classical Latin and Greek, instead of the bad Latin of the mediæval schoolmen. Linacre and Erasmus wrote the school books, and Colet a simple Latin primer. These were the beginnings of the famous *St. Paul's School* that continued to abide under the shadow of St. Paul's until it was removed to the west of London in 1885. It caused a great stir in the world of letters, and Thomas More prophesied that it would be like the wooden horse filled with armed Greeks for the destruction of barbarian Troy.¹ When Convocation assembled on Feb. 6th, 1512, Colet preached a sermon to the assembled prelates, than which no more outspoken denunciation of existing evils in the Church was ever delivered. Some of the bishops were so offended at his severe tirade against the clergy, that they tried to accuse him of heresy; but Archbishop Warham vetoed the charge. And when Colet lifted up his voice against the unnecessary wars with France, his enemies tried in vain to incense the young king against him. So the cause prospered. The fame of the scholars spread throughout Europe and they rose to higher positions of influence. Erasmus became a councillor of the emperor of Germany, and More accepted a lucrative post at Henry's court. Both published books explanatory of their political principles, Erasmus setting forth the duties of a monarch in his '*Christian Prince*'; and More his notions of an ideal state in the famous '*Utopia*' (nowhere). The keynote of both books was that governments and nations exist for the good of the whole people. More's '*Utopia*' specially advocated religious toleration, but strongly discountenanced schism. It pictured all sorts of people, with differing creeds, 'worshipping together in one united and simple mode of worship, expressly so arranged as to hurt the feelings of no sect among them; so that they all might join in it as an expression of their common brotherhood in the sight of God.'² Yet its author subsequently sat as judge over many unfortunate creatures who conscientiously differed in religion from himself! But the

1 "Seebohm's Oxford Reformers—Colet, Erasmus, and More."

2 *Ibid.*

greatest work of that time was the publication (1516) of the Greek Testament, with a new Latin translation, in parallel columns; upon which Erasmus had been engaged for years. In the preface he wrote:

"I wish that even the weakest woman should read the Gospels—should read the Epistles of Paul; and I wish that they were translated into all languages, so that . . . the husbandman should sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plough, that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle, that the traveller should beguile with their stories the tedium of his journey."

This would seem a very natural wish in our day, but it was heresy when Erasmus penned it. Only he was too cosmopolitan to be arraigned by any nation. After all it was but a wish. Not even Erasmus with all his powerful friends in high places dare venture upon a vernacular translation; but he paved the way to which Wycliffe had pointed, and the Christian world must thank him. Erasmus lived to take part in many a bitter controversy that was looming in the distance, but Colet died in retirement A.D. 1519. Their friend More, now speaker of the House of Commons, began to look coldly on the work, and other men stepped into the breach.

2. Wolsey's Scheme for Church Reform.—Thomas Wolsey had now reached the zenith of his fame, though not of his ambition. He had been made archbishop of York A.D. 1514, lord high chancellor in 1515, and a cardinal the same year. In 1517, by special permission and request of the king, he became extraordinary legate of the pope with full power over all the religious houses that had been exempt from episcopal jurisdiction. The tide of public opinion was now so strongly set against the ignorance and vices of many monks and friars that Wolsey conceived a plan for their suppression. As a patron of the 'new learning,' he was able to find a good excuse. The only reasons left for the existence of monasteries, now that their piety and seclusion were things of the past, was their literary and hospitable character; but men were beginning to see that their educational work could be better done by the new schools and colleges, and that—

They need not bid, for cloistered cell,
Their neighbour and their work farewell.

Wolsey first persuaded the University of Oxford to let him remodel its statutes; and followed that up by founding a number of professorships for theology and classics, that the next generation of clergy might at least be freer from such charges of ignorance as Colet and others had brought against them. Wolsey then proceeded to enquire minutely into the condition of monasticism generally, accumulating stores of information to their great discredit. A fair summary of such information occurs in a letter received by Wolsey from the Bishop of Worcester, wherein the latter explained "the need in which monasteries stood of reformation, and that great care would be

required in dealing with nunneries, as great abuses would be found in them." In consequence Wolsey wrote to the king that there were many 'exile [alien] and small monasteries wherein neither God is served nor religion kept,' and asked that the worst and least necessary might be suppressed in order that educational institutions might be founded with their revenues. Wolsey's most practical idea was the foundation of the famous college of *Christchurch, Oxford*, with a feeding institution for it in the shape of a public grammar school in his native town of *Ipswich*. He also proposed to augment the number of bishops. There had been no increase in the English episcopate during the times of papal interference, and Wolsey desired that new bishoprics should be endowed from the revenues of suppressed monasteries. He did not live to see this larger scheme completed, but the wisdom of the plan was so clear that it was subsequently carried out, as we shall explain fully in the next chapter. He also endeavoured to persuade the Church in France to join the Church of England in repudiating papal supremacy, but did not succeed. He played in fact a double game. His love of popularity and desire to serve the king moved him to side with public opinion in England against the foreign jurisdiction; but as his excessive ambition caused him to covet the papal chair it was not his desire that England should be cut off from communion with Rome, or that Hildebrand's idea of an Universal Church recognising a single earthly chief should fall to the ground. The king at this time had great confidence in his chancellor, and entered heartily into his projects, with the result that Wolsey was allowed to summon the Convocations of York and Canterbury in his legatine capacity for a joint synod at Westminster, A.D. 1523, to formulate and carry out the suggested reforms; bulls being obtained from Rome for the purpose. This resulted in the suppression in many different counties of forty monasteries of nearly every religious order of monks and nuns, but chiefly Benedictine, Augustinian, and Cistercian; and the introduction of new disciplinary rules in many other houses, chiefly the Augustinian. On the other hand Wolsey was himself the greatest offender



CARDINAL WOLSEY.

in a different branch of ecclesiastical abuses. He was a man of luxurious tastes who accumulated great wealth by holding *in commendam* a number of the richest benefices in England and abroad, and thus was able to build and maintain great palaces at Hampton Court, Esher, Fleet Street, and Whitehall, where he lived in almost regal state until the equally extravagant king was filled with envy. Wolsey's rapid rise in influence and wealth was exceeded by the rapidity of his degradation. He was not willing that the king should be divorced from his first wife without the consent of the pope, whereupon he was dismissed from the Court, and deprived of his high offices one by one; Sir Thomas More succeeding him as chancellor (1529). The fortune Wolsey had amassed was made a further cause of offence, and in the manner of the time it was declared confiscate. As Henry never ruined a man by halves, or allowed him opportunity to regain popularity, Wolsey's degradation was quickly followed by a trumped-up charge of treason. On his way from York

to London to answer this accusation the Cardinal was taken ill at Leicester Abbey, where he died in a few hours. Readers are asked to remember that all Wolsey's wise and temperate schemes for Church Reform were made long before the king's domestic difficulties arose; that they were in active operation up to the time of his fall; and although temporarily checked by his death were shortly afterwards carried on with vigour. Sir Thomas More made them the subject of his earliest official utterances as lord chancellor. They are therefore looked upon by many, apparently with good reason, as the first effective be-



LEICESTER ABBEY RUINS.


ginnings of actual reformation in the National Church, which had

been so earnestly desired for generations. It is a gross error to suppose that matrimonial complications of Henry VIII. were the causes of such reformation. They were occasions which accelerated some of its attendant circumstances, but all measures of Church Reform can be clearly shewn to have originated from the Church herself. It would be useless to discuss in this small book the probable direction reform would have taken had Wolsey lived to carry on the work; nor are we concerned at all with movements under individual leaders; it is sufficient for our purpose that the reformation which actually took place had its rise in a general recognition of the rights of National Churches to control their own affairs, so far as consistent with the primitive Church customs and the plain Word of God. The charge against Wolsey was that he had illegally exercised legatine authority in England contrary to the Statute of *Præmunire*. The king had given him special license to do so under the great seal, and therefore the proceedings against him were unfair. Still it shows the latent power in the statute which was well known to all lawyers of the time. The king used the ancient statute mercilessly, for his selfish ends no doubt, but everything was done under existing law.

3. The King's Divorce.—It is necessary to glance briefly at Henry's domestic troubles. They came about in this way:—Henry VII. had two sons, Arthur and Henry. Arthur was married to Princess Catharine of Arragon while yet a boy, and died, so it was afterwards alleged by the lady, before the marriage was consummated. Henry VII. then betrothed Catherine to his still younger son Henry, in defiance of the table of affinity, obtaining for the purpose a dispensation from the bishop of Rome. One of the evils attending the papacy had been and still is its assumption of power to allow rich appellants to marry within the prohibited degrees of relationship, and to annul admittedly valid unions, thus violating the sanctity of marriage. Prince Henry at first repudiated the alliance, but on succeeding to his father's throne as Henry VIII. was advised to publicly acknowledge the illegal union. This marriage was a fruitful source of trouble in after days, owing to the singular fatality that followed the offspring of it. When all the children died, except Princess Mary, some one suggested to the king that it was a judgment from heaven; and when a marriage between the surviving child and a French prince was prevented, through doubt of her legitimacy, he wished to divorce his queen. There were not wanting ladies glad to occupy her place. Henry's real reason may be traced to this latter cause. Queen Catharine, being much older than himself, was now a faded invalid, long past her prime, while he was in the vigour of manhood and desirous of marrying an attractive lady of court, named Anne Boleyn. Justice and equity demanded that the best should have

been made of his bad bargain with Catherine, after a union of more than 20 years, and therefore the king's action was inexcusable. At that time all questions relating to marriage were decided by the Church courts. Negotiations were set on foot between Henry and the pope in 1527 with the object of setting aside the marriage, which a previous pope had wrongly sanctioned ; but the pope had to consider other European princes who were related to the queen, and delayed decision so long that Henry, in disgust, determined to take up the cause of the national clergy who were writhing under the papal yoke, and hastened the passage of the measures (recommended

by the Convocations) which declared (A.D. 1531) that the bishop of Rome should no longer have jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal, in England, and that the king alone ought to have supreme authority. A special act enabling him to divorce Catharine was then a very easy matter. Her appeal to papal arbitration in the year 1529 gave rise to the statute (24 Henry VIII., c. 12) which confirmed in a stringent manner all previous laws against appeals to Rome. Acting on the assumption that his first marriage was illegal, the king married Anne Boleyn in January, 1533. The divorce was not pronounced until three months later. Catharine died in 1536, and was buried in *Peterborough Cathedral*. We have here



NORTH TRANSEPT, PETERBORO' CATHEDRAL.

expressed in few sentences the result of debates, passions, and

intrigues during several years, which some people have thought to be the chief cause of the English Reformation. In reality it was only an incident in a great drama, of which the prologue and plot must be looked for elsewhere. Henry's great advocate was *Thomas Cranmer*, who was sent to Rome in 1530 to plead against the appeal lodged by Queen Catharine the previous year. He became archbishop of Canterbury on the death of Warham (March, 1533), in return for his help in furnishing the king with arguments in favour of the divorce. Cranmer's first act on attaining the primacy was to pronounce Catharine's marriage void. The pope resented this defiant act by declaring (Sept., 1533) it to be valid. Cranmer then became the leader of the anti-papal movement, and his name has been associated, in consequence, with all the good and all the evil that those times brought forth, according to the prejudiced ideas of different partisans; so that some consider him a saint, while others load his memory with ignominy. With the exception of Fisher, the aged bishop of Rochester, the prelates were unanimously of opinion that the king's marriage with Catharine was invalid; and there was no serious opposition in the House of Lords to the statutes directed against papal authority that preceded or succeeded the divorce. Englishmen had long been wishing to get rid of the foreign jurisdiction; and when there was a possibility of obtaining their desire, and pleasing the popular king at the same time, all parties in the State were pleased. The sequence of events at this time is noteworthy. Wolsey's reforms were in full progress by 1523; the divorce was not thought of until four years after, nor did it become an accomplished fact until 1533; whereas the chief steps by which the National Church regained its independence had been taken at the suggestion of Convocation before that event, and independently of it.

4. Convocation and the Seven Years' Parliament.—In the year 1529 a new Parliament was called together; and as there was not much freedom of election then it consisted chiefly of those who were friendly to the king's divorce. This Parliament lasted seven years, and passed the various statutes by which the reforming opinions received legal sanction. Because each stage in the work of reform obtained the sanction of the civil legislature, it is assumed by some that King and Parliament only undertook the work of reforming the Church, from without. But this is just the reverse of what really happened; for the Church's representative assemblies, the Convocations of York and Canterbury, *first* passed the measures and then submitted them to Parliament and the king for ratification. This still remains the practice and privilege of the National Church; which has never surrendered its power and

1 Wayland Joyce's *Acts of Convocation*, and Amos' *Statutes of the Reformation*.

authority 'to ordain, change and abolish' its ceremonies and rites, nor allowed princes the ministering of God's Word or the Sacraments. The question of *Jurisdiction* cannot be considered a purely ecclesiastical one, because no doctrine or ceremony is affected thereby; so that statutes against the pope's authority might very properly have been formulated without consulting the Church. But as a matter of fact Parliament rarely ventured upon such matters until Convocation had taken the initiative. For instance, we find that it was Convocation (A.D. 1531), speaking in the name of the National Church, which suggested that the obedience of England should be withdrawn from the see of Rome. The cause was not the divorce in any degree, but the pressure of the papal taxation. The papal Curia would not appoint to a bishopric unless the nominee paid to the pope the whole of his first year's income in advance, together with large sums for bulls of consecration and admission to the see. The clergy had just been punished under *Præmunire* for accepting Wolsey as papal legate (see next page) and they naturally argued that an illegal authority could not demand tribute. So they petitioned the king to 'ordain in this present Parliament that these *annates* or first fruits should no longer be paid, and that if the pope should proceed to enforce payment, by interdict or otherwise, then the obedience of the king and his people should be altogether withdrawn from the pope.' Parliament assented to the petition of Convocation by passing a statute (25 Hen. VIII., c. 20) in accordance with its terms. Disinterested motives could hardly have been expected from the king at this juncture, because he wished to obtain the sanction of the pope for his divorce. He withheld his final assent to give that pontiff time for consideration; but it became law by letters patent as soon as Henry found he would not yield. Thus although the divorce had nothing to do with the petition of Convocation, it had all to do with the decision of the king. And so throughout. The need of the Church was made to serve the personal interest of Henry VIII. Henry readily acceded to the petition of the clergy that annates should not be paid to the pope, but as soon as the royal supremacy was regained he ordered that they should be paid to himself instead of to Rome. The Church led the van also in the complete repudiation of papal authority, for on March 31, 1534, the Convocation of Canterbury declared that 'the bishop of Rome hath no greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God over this country than any other foreign bishop.' The Convocation of York made a similar declaration on the 5th May that year, and the clergy and monks of both provinces, almost without exception, readily signed the document. It was some months afterwards that the Act (25 Hen. VIII., c. 21) was passed prohibiting the publication of any more papal bulls; and still later (26 Hen. VIII., c. 1) before Parliament legalized the royal supremacy; while it was not until the next Parliament (1537) that the decisive and final statute (28 Hen. VIII., c. 10) terminated for ever

the pope's jurisdiction in England. This Parliament passed many other statutes dealing with smaller matters arising out of the above, and with the royal supremacy; it also restricted certain privileges that had accrued to the clergy through their connection with Rome, such as the constitution of the Ecclesiastical Courts. Convocation gave its formal assent after discussion, but no vital principle was affected thereby. The point to be insisted on is that the 'Seven Years Parliament' did not pass a single statute nor clause of a statute, which had for its object the annihilation of the old religious body of the land, or the formation of a new religious body; and that all the changes received the prior assent of the old National Church, by its own representative assembly of Convocation, which sat concurrently with parliament throughout. The declared object of Parliament was the restoration of rights and privileges anciently held but afterwards usurped; although it must be confessed that over anxiety to preserve the rights of laymen resulted in loss to the clergy of several privileges they had long enjoyed.

5. The Royal Supremacy.—It has often been said with a sneer that because Clement VII. declined to minister to his passion Henry VIII. destroyed papal power in England, and made himself the pope of a Church of his own creation. This is a short and easy but very untrue way of dealing with the complications of that time. The supremacy of the English kings was no new thing, although it had been in abeyance for a time. It is true that Henry revived it, and obtained explanatory statutes confirming his actions under ancient ones, but it was well understood that the principles were sufficiently assured by the older ones. The *Præmunire* statute of Richard II., under which Wolsey had been charged with treason, contained a clause that all abettors and counsellors of any persons chargeable under that act were equally liable to its penalties. A great stir was caused by Henry's determination to enforce that clause; for all the clergy and laity had acquiesced in Wolsey's exercise of legatine authority, thus violating the letter of the ancient law. Parliament made an abject apology in the name of the laity, and were dismissed with a sharp reprimand. Convocation as representing the clergy did not escape so easily, for they had to pay an enormous fine before the king would pardon them. This was in 1530. Anything more arbitrary than the king's action in this matter cannot be conceived, but it is well that we should understand what terrible statutes were hanging over the heads of those who in this country should assent to papal jurisdiction before the so-called breach with Rome, and while it was still possible that the pope might sanction the divorce. It is supposed that the king desired to obtain an unconditional acknowledgment of his supremacy over the Church; but he did not get it. A statute was framed to legalize the imposition of the above mentioned fine, which spoke of "the English

Church and clergy of which the king alone is protector and *Supreme Head*." But the Convocations refused to accept such unqualified terms; and had them limited by making the clause read "the English Church and clergy of which we recognise his Majesty as the singular protector, the sole and supreme ruler, and, *so far as is allowed by the law of Christ*,¹ the *Supreme Head*." The debates of Convocation on this point were very useful because they drew forth explanations from the king that no intrusion into priestly functions was meant by the rejected title, but only the resumption of jurisdiction over spiritual things so far as they included matters of property and justice. The clergy and laity were almost unanimous in assenting to the king's supremacy as so limited; but there were several prominent persons who disliked the tendency of affairs, and con-



SIR THOMAS MORE'S HOUSE, CHELSEA

scientiously objected to the king's proposed divorce or any limitation of the pope's existing authority. Chief among them were John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, the lord chancellor. The latter, foreseeing that troubles were brewing, resigned his office, and lived in close retirement at his ancestral home in Chelsea, his place as chief adviser of the Crown being filled by *Thomas Cromwell*. (See page 51). The great 'Act of Supremacy' (26 Hen. VIII., c. 1) expressly states in the preamble the prior


¹ The law of Christ as laid down in the New Testament (Rom. xiii. 1-6 and 1 Pet. ii. 13-16) clearly indicates that submission should be made by Christians to the civil rulers, because they are placed in their high position to bear the sword of justice as God's ministers, and therefore, as our 37th Article rightly declares, the monarch has chief power 'over all estates of men in this realm, ecclesiastical or civil.'

existence of the right, and its acceptance by the Convocation; and that the clauses which followed were only intended to corroborate and confirm. Nor can there be doubt on this point. Bishops Gardiner of Winchester, and Tunstall of Durham, who afterwards became chief advisers of Queen Mary, took pains to explain that 'no new thing was introduced when the king was declared to be the Supreme Head.' Lawyers all agree that power was *restored* to the Crown, not conferred upon it, and that the results of the acts enabled Henry VIII. to *reassume* the authority and prerogatives of the Crown from which the kings of England had never formally departed, though they had for a century connived at an invasion and usurpation of them. Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher were the only men of importance who objected to this statute of supremacy when all chief persons in the realm were required to take the oath which it imposed, and they were sent to the Tower for their resistance (April 1534). They did not object to the *Succession Act* (26 Hen. VIII., c. 2) which legalized the offspring of Henry's second marriage, for both offered to swear allegiance to Anne Boleyn's children in preference to those of Queen Catharine; but they declined to accept the particular form of oath submitted because they had persuaded themselves that allegiance to the pope ought not to be withdrawn. That this position was well understood at Rome is clear from the circumstance that a cardinal's hat was sent to Bishop Fisher, which incensed the king still further. The bishop of Rome responsible for this ill-advised act was Paul III. He launched all manner of interdicts and excommunications against England and its king, absolved Henry's subjects from their allegiance, and incited other European princes to depose him. The king of France remonstrated against such rashness, and the anathemas were withheld until the dissolution of monasteries and suppression of shrines were nearly completed (1539). After lingering more than a year in the Tower, Bishop Fisher was beheaded for high treason, June 22nd, 1535; and Sir Thomas More met with the same ill-fate on July 6th. The judicial murders of two such men as these will always be deplored; but they had made themselves the champions of a system, conscientiously no doubt, which had wrought intolerable injury to our country; and now that a determination to resume national rights was on all hands agreed to, those who resisted were accounted traitors to the common weal. Dissatisfaction was freely expressed abroad at such extreme measures, but Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and Fox, bishop of Hereford, were sent to France and Saxony to explain matters. It is thought by some that the repudiation of papal jurisdiction was a violation of an existing compact between the Church of England and Rome, but as there is no law, canon, statute, or decree on record in all our history, assenting to papal authority in this land, such a position is quite untenable. The Church of England gladly assented to the restored supremacy of the

English Crown, that she might be more free to reform doctrinal abuses than the popes were willing to allow; but there was no idea of exchanging autocrats. Therefore, when Henry VIII. desired a right of veto in matters of doctrine, by demanding that all the canons or rules of the Church should be submitted for his approval, Convocation at once resisted his claim. It was willing that all old canons, not belonging to matters of faith, should be examined by a competent committee as to whether they contained anything contrary to the peace of the realm or the honour of the king;—and rightly so, because it is possible to conceive that a great community like the National Church might occasionally be induced to promulgate laws for itself, that would prove detrimental to other national interests. Convocation also agreed that no *new* canons should be imposed without the royal assent; and that letters of business should be procured from the Crown before it proceeded to formulate any new ones; but it was clearly understood that Convocation refused to surrender the Church's ancient privilege of decreeing its own rites and ceremonies. These decisions were afterwards embodied in a statute (25 Hen. VIII., c. 19) called '*The Submission of the Clergy.*' There are other misconceptions abroad respecting this period. The statute (25 Hen. VIII., c. 20) forbidding payment of first fruits to Rome, and the statute (25 Hen. VIII., c. 21) forbidding the issue of papal bulls in England which had been thought necessary for the consecration of a bishop, are often quoted as if they transferred from the bishop of Rome to the English king the power of appointing new bishops. But *they did not create any new power.* They merely restored an ancient prerogative that dated from the times of the Heptarchy, when it was necessary for the safety of a missionary bishop that he should have the protection and licence of the Crown to work in a given area. The prerogative had been lost by Henry I. and King John, when the election of bishops was nominally vested in the cathedral chapters; but chapter elections were never more than nominal, for they had always been forced to elect either the papal or the royal nominee. (See Vol. I., p. 202). The last bulls received in England were those relating to the consecration of Archbishop Cranmer. Henceforth the bishops had to take out commissions from the king; and among those who did so were Bishops Gardiner, Bonner, and Tonstall, who subsequently opposed the progress of reforming measures. The commissions received by bishops from the king distinguished in terms between the divine authority bestowed through ordination and the power of jurisdiction apart from the purely spiritual office, which the king alone may give.¹

¹ See *Institution of Christian Man* (drawn up A.D. 1537 by a commission comprising all the bishops and twenty-five other learned clergy) wherein jurisdiction is understood to be *punitive*, such as excommunication; *delegative*, as giving clergy control over parishes; and *legislative*, such as making canons.

8. **Foreign Influences.**—We must now refer briefly to continental reforms that indirectly influenced those in England. All Europe was ringing with horror at the shameless traffic in indulgences, called by Erasmus 'the crime of false pardons,' which a man named *Tetzel* was then hawking in the pope's name. Princes were offered and accepted a share in the proceeds for allowing him to trade with them in their dominions; although there were honest rulers like the Elector Frederick of Saxony, who declined to assist in such shameless defrauding of their people. In the dominions of Duke Frederick lived the fearless friar, *Martin Luther*, who nailed upon the door of All Saints' Church, Wittenberg, a long list of objections to the trade, which set the Western World ablaze with controversy. He followed this up with a pamphlet against papal doctrine, entitled, *The Babylonish Captivity of the Church*. In 1520 the pope issued a bull declaring Luther a dangerous heretic, and ordered Duke Frederick to deliver him over to the papal courts for trial. The duke took counsel of Erasmus before taking action; and the latter, while objecting to the violent language of the hot-tempered Luther, advised the duke to protect him. But Luther could not be gentle. He flung down the gauntlet of defiance by publicly burning the bull; and with it a complete set of the Roman canon-law books, in token of his conviction that Germany should be free from the pope's jurisdiction. The right of National Churches to independent self-government was everywhere becoming an accepted necessity, but there were different opinions as to how it should be obtained. Those who followed Martin Luther adopted revolutionary methods. In England it was obtained by firm adhesion to the Constitution and ancient customs. A significant sign of the importance attached to Luther's proceedings appears in the fact that Henry VIII. wrote a book against the 'Babylonish Captivity' which appeared in August 1521. It defended papal authority as of Divine origin, and so pleased the pope, to whom it was presented, that in a special consistory the title of *Defender of the Faith* was solemnly conferred upon the king; a



MARTIN LUTHER.

title which his successors have since retained, though from different motives. Luther at once replied in violent terms to his royal antagonist, and was controverted in turn by Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More, whose books did much to prevent their authors from accepting subsequent repudiations of papal jurisdiction. This controversy was accompanied by public burnings in England of Lutheran books by the authority of Wolsy; a circumstance often stated to his discredit, when really it was proof of his moderation. For he had been urged to promote repressive measures against the persons of those who accepted Lutheran ideas, which must have resulted in the deaths of many, but as he considered that an ostentatious destruction of their writings would be a sufficient warning he altogether declined to proceed to extremities. Lutheranism did not take root in this country. After the repudiation of papal interference an attempt was made through Cranmer's influence (1538) to Lutheranize the Church; but it failed because the German teachers, whom he had invited, made so many objections to the English customs. Their propositions for reforming the Church were controverted by the king, and thus retarded rather than assisted the removal of abuses. It was natural that other countries besides England should produce reformers, and they were very numerous in the Swiss cantons, of whom *Ulrich Zwingli* was the chief; and in Geneva, where they were led by *John Calvin*. Both these men held novel ideas respecting Holy Communion, and both quarrelled with Luther. Neither cared a whit for Apostolic traditions or saw any virtue in the Church's historic continuity. Calvin made himself civil and religious dictator of Geneva, and banished all who dared dispute his dogmas; one man, *Servetus*, being burned for venturing to differ from him on a point of doctrine. Calvin's religious system was set forth in a book called *The Institutes*, published by him in 1536. Until these new reformers had grown too powerful to be resisted they were greatly persecuted, especially in France. Through Cranmer's influence many were allowed to take refuge in this country. We must admit that the advice and researches of the learned among them were of immense value to our Church in its work of self-reform, because of their experience in the doctrinal contests of their time; and we cannot help perceiving that English hospitality to them was repaid with interest when reactionary parties held the field; but nevertheless it is clear that the foreign reformers introduced many revolutionary ideas, which were subversive of all rule and authority, whether in Church or Realm; and that their objections to alterations and translations subsequently made in the service books, because their own suggestions were not in every case accepted, proved an ultimate thorn in the side of the national clergy; for the foreigners at once proceeded to sow the seed of Nonconformity, which afterwards bore much wild fruit in the shape of political and religious dissensions.

7. Translations of the Scriptures.—Reference was made in our first volume to early and partial translations of the Scriptures, and to Wycliffe's complete version. But Wycliffe's Bible had only been distributed in manuscript portions, and was full of obsolete phrases unintelligible to the 16th century, while it contained an unorthodox preface that effectually prevented its acceptance by the clergy. The Greek Testament of Erasmus has also been alluded to. Their results must now be considered. The constant appeals to Scripture which marked the controversies of Henry's reign made the nation earnestly desire a better knowledge of its contents. A University scholar, William Tyndall, asked the bishop of London (Fitz James) to grant him facilities to make an English translation (1523), but his application came at the time when Luther's writings were being suppressed, and the project was coldly received. So Tyndall went to Hamburg, where he secretly translated the New Testament. It was printed at Worms by Schoeffer, A.D. 1526. Fifteen thousand copies were produced, smuggled into England in bales of merchandise, and sold at a cheap rate all over the country. Portions of the Old Testament appeared four years later. The clergy feared that the indiscriminate and undirected perusal of an admittedly inaccurate version of the Scriptures might produce lamentable consequences, and the new bishop of London (Cuthbert Tunstall) bought up all the copies he could find and publicly burnt them. The money so expended served to furnish Tyndall with the means for new editions. Sir Thomas More exposed the imperfections and inaccuracies of the new translation, in a pamphlet filled with unmitigated abuse; to which Tyndall replied in phrases to correspond. Strong language was the order of that day. Had Tyndall kept his great work out of the mire of controversy he would have been a hero. Indeed, for his English version formed the basis of all subsequent translations. Previous versions had been made from Latin translations, as was Wycliffe's; but Tyndall, though indebted to Wycliffe's Bible for most of his phrases, was the first to attempt an English translation of the New Testament out of the original Greek, and the greater portion of the Old Testament from Hebrew. But he seriously weakened the usefulness of his labours by adding a running commentary in the margins, containing many strong aspersions upon contemporary abuses. Had he left the Sacred Word to tell its own tale in the mother tongue all might have been well. As it was, he gave his adversaries an excuse to destroy him, for after a rigorous imprisonment the Germans burnt him in 1536. The English clergy repeatedly disclaimed any desire to withhold the Scriptures from the people; and declared that their only object was to prevent the distribution of inaccurate, seditious, or unorthodox editions. When it became clear that the country would not be satisfied without a vernacular translation of the Bible. Convocation earnestly pleaded with the king that the English bishops should make a new translation

that could be issued with authority (1534). Meanwhile several other private versions were issued. The first of them was by *Miles Coverdale*, who translated from St. Jerome's 4th century Latin version, known as the Vulgate, which had long been used in England; taking much English phraseology from Wycliffe and Tyndall. This did not receive the express sanction of Convocation or the Crown, but it was allowed to be freely sold, and may be considered the first English Bible. It dates from 1535. Two years later *Matthews'* Bible was published, which was merely a reprint of Tyndall's as far as that went, the rest being supplied from Coverdale's. This version received the king's assent, but Convocation objected to its inaccuracies. The variations in these different editions clearly indicate the need of some more



READING THE BIBLE IN THE CRYPT OF OLD ST. PAUL'S.

careful and scholarly rendering. Eventually the bishops, who had been engaged in the work for five years, issued in 1539 what is known as the *Great Bible*, and this was ordered to be set up in all the churches. Because of the great cost incurred in producing and printing a bible in those days, especial care was taken for the safety of copies by chaining them to oak desks or stone walls. Our illustration gives an idea of the desire for knowledge of the truth that then pervaded all classes in the land. Very few could read, but all could listen. The explicit terms of the proclamation which granted and thus provided an open Bible in the vernacular will well bear repetition. Every parish priest was

thereby ordered to 'provide one book of the whole Bible, of the largest volume, in English, and have the same set up in some convenient place within the church, whereat the parishioners may most commodiously resort to the same, and read it,' and the clergy were further instructed to 'discourage no man, privily or openly, from reading the same Bible, but to expressly provoke, stir, and exhort every person to read the same, as that which is the very lively Word of God.' In 1543 the orderly reading of Scripture in the Church services on Sundays and holydays, a lesson from the Old and a lesson from the New Testament, was ordered by Convocation. When the Scriptures in English were thus authorised and publicly read, there was less reason to find fault with the statute (34 & 35 Hen. VIII., c. 1) which prohibited all annotated copies of the Bible, such as Tyndall's, from being circulated or read.

8. Doctrinal Reforms.—Next to the Bible in importance comes the *Liturgy*, or 'Service Book,' which comprises and limits the doctrines and worship of the Church. The Latin service books already referred to (Vol. I., p. 155) had been so altered by additions and complication that great inconvenience was felt in using them; and the same causes which required an English Bible, demanded that the public worship of the Church should be offered in a language "understanded of the people." Just as there had been portions of the Scripture in English from the earliest times, so had there been English books of prayer for private use called Primers, and interlined translations of the ancient "Uses"; although the services had always been said or sung in Latin. The book for the ordinary daily services was called the *Breviary*, and that for the Communion Service the *Missal*; the Ordination Services formed a separate book called the *Pontifical*, besides which there was the *Manual*, containing the Occasional Offices which a priest could perform. Our own Book of Common Prayer is practically a compilation from these different books, simplifying their arrangement and omitting the erroneous accretions which were introduced after the Norman conquest. So early as the year 1516, and again in 1531 and 1542, Convocation revised the *Sarum Breviary* by simplifying the rubrics and arranging for the orderly reading of all the Scriptures. In 1542 Convocation appointed a committee to thoroughly revise the same and translate it into English, omitting all references to the bishop of Rome which had crept in, and abolishing the memorials of mediæval saints. The work was not concluded until the beginning of the next reign, but a portion of their labours appeared in 1543-4 when the *Litany* was published in English and ordered to be sung in all churches every Sunday and Holy-day. This edition of the *Litany* was disfigured by the petition to be delivered "from the bishop of Rome and his detestable enormities." The leading spirit of these revisions was Archbishop Cranmer; to whom was due also the

direction of the revision of the Scriptures, known as the Great Bible, from which our Prayer Book Psalms are taken. There need not be any mistake respecting the motives which guided Convocation in their liturgical revisions; for the statute (25 Hen. VIII., c. 21), which forbade the issue of papal bulls in England disclaimed any intention "to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in anything concerning the very [true] Articles of the Catholic Church." The communion by doctrine, devotion, and discipline with all true adherents of apostolic faith and primitive Church customs, has always been the aim and object of English Churchmen. They have not always been able to prevent the introduction of errors and abuses, and in their efforts to shake them off not always free from recklessness, but throughout all changes and chances they have been providentially enabled to preserve inviolate the fundamental principles of catholic and apostolic truth. To allay the fears of such as thought events were moving too fast, Convocation drew up (A.D. 1536) *Ten Articles*, five doctrinal and five ceremonial, which controverted extreme opinions of Reformers and Romanizers alike, and asserted the Bible and three Creeds to be the only true basis of faith; and the first four Catholic Councils to be the only authority for Church discipline; thus going back at a bound to the decision of Theodore's synod at Hatfield, A.D. 680.¹ These Ten Articles were afterwards embodied in a book of instruction for the laity, entitled "The Institution of a Christian Man," and commonly called the *Bishop's Book*; which was drawn up at Cranmer's Lambeth residence and signed by all the dignitaries. It contained admirable expositions of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments; and statements respecting other subjects that were then matters of controversy, which were considerably modified later on.

9. **The Reactionary Party.**²—Party spirit in those days ran higher than it does now. Moreover the religious question was almost the only one that the country cared for. So that all the political influence of governments and aspirants to office was ranged in opposing forces which did battle for or against the reforming principles. Convocation itself was very equally divided, and when a new Parliament met in 1539, followed by a reconstructed Privy Council which promoted only anti-reformers to Church offices carrying seats in Convocation, those who were suspected of religious opinions which had produced such sad revolutions abroad were treated with considerable severity. The party opposed to further reforms comprised the extremists who believed in papal supremacy, and whose sympathies for Queen Catharine, Bishop Fisher, and Sir Thomas More, made them revengeful; those also who would have

¹ See Vol. I., p. 89. ² See, however, Stubbs' Const. Hist. III., p. 119.

been content with the royal supremacy, but who deprecated the pitiless dissolution of monasteries which we shall treat of in the next chapter; and those who, though prepared to accept the 'Ten Articles, objected to the Continental reformers who surrounded Archbp. Cranmer. Thus a reaction began; and after the Lutheran divines had indiscreetly denounced the English ceremonial, the Duke of Norfolk succeeded in passing through Parliament the Statute of the *Six Articles* (31 Hen. VIII., c. 14) containing terrible penal provisions on six points of doctrine and discipline; the effect of which was to restore temporarily transubstantiation, celibacy of the clergy, private masses, communion in one kind, and compulsory confession; and to declare that although the monasteries had been dissolved, the



vows of their late inmates were still binding. That a majority in Convocation was induced to sanction this statute proves that there was a growing aversion to the rapidity of recent changes. The severity of the Six Article Statute was intentional. Its bark was worse than its bite. Men were afraid to offend, and therefore its penalties were seldom enforced. Accounts as to persons suffering under it are very conflicting. In 1543 its provisions were made less stringent and in 1547 it was repealed altogether. But while it was in force great terror seized many of the bishops and clergy. Bishops *Latimer* and *Shaxton* resigned their sees, and were placed in the custody of bishops of opposite opinions; while Cranmer was the subject of many conspiracies and had to separate from his wife. A

monarch is generally credited with the good that arises during his reign, even though his sanction may have been unwillingly given; but the religious progress in the reign of Henry VIII. is by no means due exclusively to him. It was the effort made by the Church to satisfy the cravings of her children. The Church was still a power in the land. Her prerogatives were not yet assailed, and although Convocation was often unduly pressed by the king to hurry on the work of reform, neither Parliament nor king would then have dared to alter anything without its sanction. And the Clergy through Convocation, did not consent to any changes that would impair its apostolic fellowship or Catholic doctrine, its ministerial succession, or the validity of its sacramental ordinances. It was doubtless owing to Cranmer's moderation and meekness, which made him bend to storms while others would be ruined by resisting them, that the Church was safely steered through the rest of Henry's reign; and the action of those who would have restored the papal domination rendered ineffectual. Henry VIII. died on the 28th Jan., 1547, having previously devised the succession by will to his son Edward; and, in default of heirs, to his daughters Mary and Elizabeth in order. As Edward was but ten years old, Henry willed that sixteen executors should form a council of regency until the lad was eighteen years of age. Henry had all along striven to preserve the balance of parties, and he nominated to this council pronounced upholders of each class of religious opinion, obviously intending that there should be as little change as possible. But it was found that the reforming party predominated and obtained the highest offices. (See page 61).

CHAPTER XVIII.

DISSOLUTION OF THE MONASTERIES.

"The tapers shall be quenched, the belfries mute,
And, 'mid their choirs unroofed by selfish rage,
The warbling wren shall find a leafy cage.

* * * * *

Yet some noviciates of the cloistral shade,
Or chained by vows, with undissembled glee
The warrant hail—exulting to be free."—*Wordsworth.*

1. Pre-Norman and Post-Norman Religious Houses.—The peculiar and extensive character of the Dissolution of Monasteries, and the issues involved, require special and separate treatment. The usual plan of explaining their suppression is to point out that those of small income and few inmates were first assailed, and afterwards the greater and richer ones. This method is chronologically

accurate and easily understood, but it omits important considerations which should not be overlooked. A sharp line of distinction ought to be drawn between religious houses founded before the Norman Conquest,

or reconstituted at the beginning of that epoch, and those which were introduced in and after the 12th century.¹ Generally speaking, and with few exceptions, the monasteries founded before the 12th century recognised the right of the bishop to visit and correct their houses. And it must be remembered that all such earlier foundations belonged either to the ancient *Benedictine Order* or to the Early Norman developments of it known as the 'Augustinian' and 'Clunian' orders,² and we may class these more ancient foundations under the generic title of *National Monasteries*, seeing that they submitted to the jurisdiction of the English bishops. Many of them had a rich heritage of historic memories. Some, like Glastonbury, had an uninterrupted existence from obscure Celtic ages; and others, like Canterbury and Lindisfarne, from the earliest Saxon times. Their life and traditions were bound up with the national history, while a thousand recollections endeared them to gentle and simple alike. Some were for men, such as Edmondsbury and St. Albans; and others were homes for gentlewomen and schools for young ladies, as at Godstow Nunnery in Oxfordshire. But after the year 1129, when the *Cistercian Order* came to Surrey, very few, if any, Benedictine houses were founded. The bishop of Rome was then beginning to exercise direct authority in England, and the



BENEDICTINE NUN.

Cistercians were under his immediate control. Their settlement in Britain received his express sanction—not merely that they might introduce a more severe method of religious life—but chiefly that they might help forward papal aggrandisement. The same is true of the *Carthusian Monks* who commenced to settle here in 1181, and of the numerous smaller religious orders subsequently founded;

¹ Vol. I., pp. 179-185.

² Vol. I., pp. 161 and 179.

especially the Mendicant Friars.¹ These new religious orders commenced by obtaining special privileges from the bishop of Rome, by which they could claim exemption from English episcopal jurisdiction, and ended by setting up their houses all over the land. They soon excited the jealousy of the earlier foundations (many of whom were led to similar exemption in order to preserve their prestige), and ultimately they brought the whole conventual system into discredit. It is true that good, learned, and patriotic men were often found among these later orders, but speaking generally we must class the 'post-Norman' celibate foundations under the generic title of *Foreign Monasteries*. Visitors to any 'minster' or 'abbey' church, or to the ruins of such, should always enquire which order of monks were settled there, and what was the date of its *original* foundation. The answers will help to explain why some are still used by the National Church and others not. It cannot be a mere coincidence that the monastery churches still in use are, almost invariably of pre-Norman origin, and generally of the Benedictine order; the only exceptions being the public portions of churches belonging to foreign monasteries which had *supplanted* a pre-Norman parish church. Apart from the purely patriotic feeling, great dissatisfaction had been aroused against the conventual life on account of the doctrinal abuses already referred to, which were protected chiefly and most offensively by the celibate orders. Their rules were severe enough, had they been properly observed, but the spirit of them was constantly violated. As time went on each Order became worldly, and its members, instead of leading secluded lives apart from the busy haunts of men, mixed freely in society; and so the chief reason of their foundation was annulled. There is no need to recount in detail the misdeeds recorded against them; suffice to say that charges of immorality, hypocrisy, and luxurious living were proved against the majority up to the hilt, and not denied. If vows of chastity, self-denial, and poverty could not furnish safeguards against breaches of the moral law they deserved to be done away. The acknowledged bad character of many who professed excessive piety brought all religion into discredit; and the notorious scandals to which they gave rise, combined with the attempts made by 'foreign' houses to de-nationalise the ancient Church, made all true-hearted Englishmen hail with satisfaction the various Acts of Parliament by which the land was rid of their evil influences. The celibate system was condemned as a diseased limb of the Church, needing to be cut off to ensure the safety of its main trunk. We record its decay with much regret; because the system had been productive of much that was good and useful in earlier times, without which our Church would have had few good works to boast of then. It had been a most efficient missionary

agency, and an exceedingly useful means of consolidating the Church. A mighty army of historians, theologians, teachers, and sincere Christians had been trained in it; and it was the foster-mother of Art, Literature, and Science. As architects, carvers in wood, stone, and metal, workers in mosaic, and painters upon glass, the monks were once unrivalled. Their houses had been the centres of civilisation, social intercourse, hospitality and safe shelter in days when roads were bad, hotels unknown, and districts thinly populated; and their relief of the sick and indigent was liberal and extensive. Many must have regretted that these invaluable services should have to cease; but monasticism had come to be looked upon as worn out and effete, chiefly through its own most grievous fault, and it had to pay the penalty of its follies. Fortunately the system was not necessary to the Church's vitality, nor was her continuous life affected by the suppression. National and anti-national foundations alike were overwhelmed in the general dissolution; but while the 'foreign' monasteries were all destroyed absolutely, so that nothing remains of them save here and there a pile of ruined masonry (as in the accompanying illustration of the Cistercian abbey church at Tintern-on-the-Wye) to testify their former grandeur, many of the old pre-Norman minsters continued to be used for the services of the Church of England, as we shall presently explain.



TINTERN ABBEY RUINS.

2. The First Suppression.—There were many precedents for the suppression of religious houses. The Knights Templars were dissolved in the year 1307;¹ the Alien Priors had followed suit in 1416;² several bishops had founded colleges out of monasteries which they had thought right to suppress;³ and Cardinal Wolsey had dissolved forty of several orders in different parts of England years before the general break-up of the system. Only careless people imagine Henry VIII. to be the originator of the plan by which the monasteries were ruined. What we may rightly assign to the charge of that king and his agents is the summary ejection of monks and nuns from their old homes, and the forcible alienation of monastic revenues to secular uses, without due care and respect for the interests involved. The easy descent of unprincipled men from one depth of iniquity to another is aptly illustrated by the increasing covetousness of those who were responsible for the general dissolution. When Wolsey suppressed any religious houses he desired to provide some more efficient means of carrying out the good work they were supposed to do; but while his example was followed in the method of suppressing the remainder, the direction in which the revenues and estates were applied was quite different. The work began by the appointment of a Royal commission to visit and inquire into the general character of all monasteries, especially as to *their foundation*, the tenor of their rules, what benefices were appropriated to them, and how they were served. Several houses were at once surrendered to the king by the inmates, which we may consider as an admission of guilt. The result of the visitation was a startling record of mischief wrought by the monks and friars in their private and professional capacities. No doubt the report was exaggerated, but after allowing a large margin for the inventiveness of the commissioners more than enough remained to demand immediate action. Upon this the Commons reluctantly passed a Statute (27 Hen. VIII., c. 28) by which all congregations of religious persons under the number of twelve, or of a less annual value than £200, were granted to the Crown absolutely. When this Act was submitted to the House of Lords it met with no opposition from the mitred abbots and bishops;⁴ a curious sign of the times. Provision was made in the act for pensioning some of the monks, and for transferring others to "such honourable and great monasteries of this realm, wherein good religion is observed, as shall be limited by the king." Some 375 houses were dissolved under this statute; their aggregate yearly revenue being £32,000, and the estimated capital value of their buildings, plate, and furniture, £100,000 more. The purchasing power of money then was about twelve times more than it is now.

1 Vol. I., p. 182. 2 See page 15. 3 See page 16.

4 The House of Lords comprised only 92 peers at that time, including 20 bishops, and 28 abbots or priors, so that the Spiritual Lords had a majority.

Henry VIII. was empowered by the statute to refound such houses as he thought fit, but it does not appear that he made much use of the privilege. A special department of State was created to deal with the proceeds of the suppression, called the "*Court of Augmentation of the King's Revenue*," which disposed of the buildings and estates to the best advantage for the king and his courtiers; but nothing was reserved for religious or educational purposes. Although the instructions to the commissioners appointed to enforce the act read fair enough, there are very sad contemporary records of the ruthless methods they adopted in despoiling the monasteries of their treasures and driving out the inmates. But the commissioners were not alone in this. Instead of receiving sympathy the disturbed inmates found that the people rejoiced in their fall. The peasantry readily assisted in destroying the buildings, that they might purchase the contents and materials at far less than real value; and there was a general scramble for the spoil. But when the monks had gone and their houses were left desolate symptoms of regret began to appear.

3. The Pilgrimage of Grace.—A.D. 1536-7.—A large number of the inmates welcomed release from their vows, and readily accepted a secular life on retiring pensions. They saw that their houses must go, and knew they had been hypocritical, and they naturally made the best terms they could with the commissioners. But on the other hand there were very many who resisted the new law; and when compulsorily expelled revealed the 'anti-national' spirit of their Order by wandering about the country, especially in Yorkshire and Lincolnshire, stirring up the people to open rebellion. They pretended to be the real defenders of Church and Realm, and clamoured for the removal of the 'low-born and evil counsellors' who had suggested the suppression to the king. Several disaffected nobles joined the movement, and many more secretly aided it with funds, but the processions were everywhere headed by deprived monks and friars, carrying crosses, banners, censers, etc., who strove to give the rebellion a religious character by declaring in their speeches that the 'Grace of God' was with them. Hence their movement was called the *Pilgrimage of Grace*. It speedily grew to proportions that endangered the public peace, and had to be put down by force of arms. Many people were led to believe the exaggerated statements of the monks until they heard the other side; but when the king sent heralds through the country to explain the real causes which made the dissolution needful, the rebellion collapsed and the ring-leaders were executed. Here is an extract from their proclamation:—"As concerning points of religion and observance the king hath done nothing, but the whole clergy of the provinces of York and Canterbury have determined the same to be conformable to GOD'S holy Word and Testament." This may help to set at rest the erroneous idea that Henry VIII. was solely responsible for Church Reform.

There is indeed abundant evidence to show that all reforms were made, not by consent of the national clergy only, but with the approval also of very many sober-minded and patriotic monks. But while agreeing that it was righteous and wise to suppress evil corporations which were opposed to the peace and dignity of the realm, and to the interests of religion, the Church had no official share in the merciless methods adopted by the king's avaricious agents. Included among the rebel leaders and supporters of the 'Pilgrimage of Grace' were several chiefs of larger houses which had long been exempt by papal authority from Episcopal control, such as the abbots of Whalley and Jervaulx, and the priors of Woburn and Burlington—all Cistercian monasteries. The commissioners arrested them for treason, and they were executed. This led to a second and more searching visitation among the greater monasteries which did not come within the letter of the Act of 1536. Now that the system could be pointed at as harbouring traitors, a way was open for the commissioners to intimidate the wealthier bodies; but it was necessary to prepare the public mind for their wholesale destruction, lest a worse rebellion should break out. This was done by publicly exposing and ridiculing the artifices by which many monks and friars had deluded the simple and superstitious into making votive offerings at the shrines in their churches. For instance, at the shrine of "Our Lady of Walsingham" it was given out that some congealed milk from the breasts of the Virgin might be seen—for a suitable consideration, of course—which was proved to be "chalk or white-lead." Also there was a famous crucifix at Boxley, in Kent, that had long awed the credulous by bowing its head and rolling its eyes when its votaries approached; and this became the laughing-stock of the time when Hilsey, bishop of Rochester, had it taken to London, and the springs which governed its movements laid bare to the public in St. Paul's churchyard. Many other delusions of like character, and the preposterous virtues ascribed to relics, were examined in plain common-sense fashion until the people were angered at the deceptions practised on them. In short, it was a time of education. The history of Archbishop Becket was rewritten in order to show that he was a rebel against his king, and not a saint at all; so that the populace might not cry out against the demolition of his shrine, and the seizure of its treasures for the king's exchequer. Clever and not over-scrupulous agents had taken the matter in hand, and they left no stone unturned by which disgrace might fall upon the religious orders.

4. The Final Suppression.—It soon became apparent that monasticism in England was doomed, and chiefly for the enrichment of flattering courtiers who gladly embraced and niggardly retained its possessions. The fear of being arrested for treason (coupled with the hope of pensions, and offices in cathedral or parochial churches

for the ordained inmates) caused many abbots and priors to surrender their houses to the king. The commissioners said that they were constantly in receipt of petitions from inmates, of both sexes, begging to be dismissed from their vows and allowed to adopt the secular habit; and by the end of 1538 very few monasteries continued to flourish. But the Act of 1536 did not contemplate the surrender of the greater monasteries, and discontent was beginning to be felt that nothing was taking their place. Therefore it was enacted (31 Hen. VIII., c. 9), "that the ill lives of those that were called religious

made it necessary to change their houses to better uses, for teaching the Word of God, instructing of children, educating of clerks [clergy], relieving of old infirm people, the endowing of readers for Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, mending of highways, and the bettering the condition of the parish priests." By this Act the king was empowered to found new bishoprics and assign their limits and divisions. Possibly this statute was made in good faith, but changes in the government before it came into operation prevented the accomplishment of its good intent. But it served the king's purpose by giving a show of reason for another statute (31 Hen. VIII., c. 13) confirming and regulating the transfers of larger monasteries which the commissioners had been able to acquire by voluntary surrender or in any other way. By this new law the remaining monasteries were soon obtained. If priors and abbots would not resign or surrender, charges could easily be brought against them under one or other of the numerous treason statutes and



A CARTHUSIAN.

anti-papal acts—the character of the evidence was not very critically examined—and sometimes men were condemned on suspicion and unheard. By the dissolution of their houses the mitred abbots were deprived of their seats in Parliament, and ever since that time the temporal peers have had the majority in the House of Lords. Of the greater monasteries suppressed 379 followed the Benedictine, Cluniac, and Augustinian rules; and 276 belonged to Cistercian, Carthusian, and minor 'foreign' orders. The voluntary surrenders came

chiefly from the former, *i.e.*, from the rulers of the *ancient* houses, which were founded long before the papal usurpations, who were in favour of Church Reform. It is impossible for a moment to justify the barbarous treatment meted out to the Carthusians by the commissioners. They certainly were cruelly dealt with according to our ideas of the value of human life. But in those days the mere suspicion of treason was enough to hang a man, and we must not forget that the Carthusians were staunch upholders of the papal claims and that their vows compelled them to refuse assent to the royal supremacy. They were convicted for treason, just as Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More had been. It was the same with the Cistercians and the Friars. And it is a singular fact that *no Carthusian, Cistercian, Friary, or other foreign monastery church has ever been used for the worship of the Reformed Church of England*, except in one or two rare instances where the 'foreign' order supplanted and appropriated the old parish church, and even there it will be found that the essentially monastic portion of the church, *i.e.*, the chancel, is destroyed, and that only the nave, in which parishioners were always allowed to worship, has been retained for their use. Many readers will at once recall the great and famous Benedictine Abbeys such as Glastonbury, Reading, Whitby, and a host besides. But the same rule applies to them. They had linked their fortunes with the papal-supremacy party; they had obtained from the bishop of Rome exemption from the control of their own diocesan; and they were either convicted of complicity in the 'Pilgrimage of Grace' rebellion, or they refused to obey the laws relating to the king's supremacy or would not afford the Commissioners facilities for visiting monasteries. Upon some such charge they would be condemned by the chief commissioner, their estates declared confiscate and their churches demolished. The second visitation of the monasteries was undertaken with the express purpose of examining how the inmates stood affected towards the bishop of Rome, and how they promoted the king's supremacy.¹ By the end of 1539 monasticism had practically ceased in England. The Knights Hospitallers was the last important order dissolved, and as they resolutely refused to give up their houses or renounce allegiance to Rome a special act (32 Hen. VIII., c. 24) was obtained to make them. A few specially exempted houses of good repute were allowed to continue during the life of Henry VIII., as also were several hospitals and monastic colleges; but by virtue of an act passed towards the end of the reign (37 Hen. VIII., c. 4) they also came to an end. The annual income of the greater monasteries was said to be £131,607, and the capital value of the buildings and moveables over £400,000.

5. The King's Vicar-General.—Henry's chief agent in the destruction of the monasteries was *Thomas Cromwell*—always to be

¹ Burnet's Hist. of Reformation—Virtue's Ed., p. 108.

distinguished from 'Oliver' Cromwell, who lived more than a century later, and who, like 'Thomas,' sought personal advancement out of



LORD THOMAS CROMWELL.

the wrecks of institutions he destroyed. He had been confidential secretary to Cardinal Wolsey, had assisted to suppress the monasteries Wolsey had condemned, and therefore had the technical knowledge requisite for the work. Through his patron's influence he obtained a seat in parliament, and when the bill of attainder against Wolsey was brought in he defended his late master with such eloquence that the bill was thrown out. His brilliant advocacy, and opposition to the papal claims, brought him rapid promotion, and he is supposed to have framed the statutes by which the regal supremacy was restored to England. It was to be expected that Henry VIII. would appoint

him to see that their provisions were properly carried out. His political career depended on the success of Church Reform. In every way possible he sought to make the king's supremacy popular. He it was who compassed the ruin of Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More, and framed the terrible treason statute (26 Hen. VIII., c. 13) under which they were beheaded; and which he subsequently applied with vigour against refractory monks. When he perceived that the public would not be satisfied without an English Bible he employed Miles Coverdale to correct and complete Tyndal's version by the Vulgate, and took care that the king should have the honour. So exceedingly clever a man, prompt and remorseless in all his dealings, exactly suited Henry; who delegated to him his spiritual jurisdiction under the title of *Vicar-General*¹ (1535), and afterwards by a special act (31 Hen. VIII., c. 10) *Lord Vicegerent*, with precedence next to the Royal family. This position gave Thomas Cromwell autocratic and irresponsible power over the bishops and clergy. It was a power similar to that of extraordinary legates of the pope—an external authority imposed upon the long-suffering Church by its acknowledged head on earth—only much greater, because of the ease by which he could enforce the death penalty. Had Thomas Cromwell lived, and retained those great powers, it is

1 "A title certainly novel and sounded ill, but there being no evidence that it was intended in a heterodox sense, the Church was not bound to resist the title or office." Palmer's "Church of Christ," Vol. I., p. 267.

possible the Church might have lost many of its rights and privileges ; but his time was so occupied with dissolving and plundering the monasteries prior to his disgrace and death that the Church suffered little from his tyranny in other directions. His avarice and cruel treatment of the monks, some of whom he condemned first and sent for trial afterwards, is in every way reprehensible. He enriched himself and his friends by taking bribes on every hand and shared the spoils of many monasteries among his near relations. But like most of Henry's agents his career was brilliant and brief. He lost the king's favour by saddling him with an ugly wife, and Henry revenged himself by charging Thomas, now Earl of Essex, with the shortcomings of an unpopular administration. A bill of attainder brought him to the block in 1540, and there were few who pitied him.

6. Distribution of Monastic Estates.—There are several reasons why satisfaction at the fall of the monastic system is not unmixed with regret, chief among them being the disposition of the revenues and estates acquired by the Court of Augmentations. It was doubted at the time whether the monks had any right to surrender absolutely estates in which they had only a life interest, and the sacred character of the property served to increase the growing opposition. To appease the people it was given out that the monastic revenues would prevent any more taxes being levied ; but to satisfy the nobles, who knew better, the proceeds of the plunder were shared among them. The parochial clergy, who had been receiving vicarial tithes from the abbeys, were told that the obligations of the monasteries would be transferred to the new owners of abbey lands, but those obligations were so often evaded that many clergy were reduced to sore distress. It was a far-seeing policy to make gifts of monastic possessions or sell them on easy terms to the nobility, because it became impossible for any future government to restore the property without impoverishing its own supporters. Many of the nobles had a reasonable claim to share in the distribution, if the determination to secularise the property was irrevocable, on the ground that their ancestors had founded the houses now dissolved. But if antiquity was to be considered a valid claim, the parish clergy had the oldest title, because most of the tithes by which the monasteries were maintained had belonged to their parishes before even the Norman nobility, who alienated them to the monasteries, came into the country. But "in no one instance were the appropriated tithes restored to the parochial clergy" (*Hallam*). They were transferred to the various laymen along with the monastic estates, and have ever since been bought and sold, inherited and willed away, the same as any other species of secular property. That is how many parochial rectorial tithes have come into the possession of the present lay-impropriators. One of the most notorious fallacies of modern times is the notion that the

property taken from the monasteries was given by Henry VIII. to the bishops and parochial clergy. Nothing of the sort ever happened. Much of the ready-money receipts was squandered recklessly by the king upon his creatures, but the bulk of the real estate passed into the hands of temporal peers. Thus three rich abbeys enabled Lord Russell to found the earldom of Bedford; seven others endowed Thomas Cromwell's earldom of Essex. The Duke of Norfolk, who disliked the dissolution, was silenced by thirteen more; and the king's brother-in-law, Charles Brandon, enriched his dukedom of Suffolk by no less than thirty. Courtiers of lesser note obtained single monasteries for their obsequiousness, as when *Newstead Abbey* was granted to Sir John Byron, and when a woman received the revenue of a con-



NEWSTEAD ABBEY RUINS.

vent because of her skill in making the king's puddings. In order to get rid of the obligation to pay pensions to the expelled monks and friars, the new holders of abbey lands often presented ordained celibates to benefices in their patronage that fell vacant, because no beneficed priest was entitled to the pensions. Many of the wealthy city merchants purchased the estates that now glutted the market, thus increasing the number of landed gentry; and, on the whole, apart from the unjust dealing towards the parochial churches, the redistribution of property so long held by an indolent and privileged class, and the consequent circulation of money, was productive of lasting good to the country at large. But no amount of beneficial

results can acquit the suppressors of wanton cruelty, injustice, and sacrilege. It has often been said that the laymen who received monastic estates were pursued by singular fatalities. Dr. Neale, e.g. wrote :

“They tell us that the Lord of Hosts will not avenge his own;

They tell us that He careth not for temples overthrown :

Go! look through England's thousand vales, and shew me, he that may,

The Abbey lands that have not wrought their owner's swift decay.”

In this practical age the fulfilment of anathemas may be considered superstitious, and the troubles that pursued the Tudor nobility may be accounted for on quite different grounds, but it must always seem remarkable that the curses prophesied in ancient times against any who should afterwards violate ecclesiastical revenues, lands, and buildings, or alienate them to secular uses, were fulfilled.

7. Monastic Churches made Cathedral.—One great result of the dissolution was the creation of six new bishoprics—Westminster in 1540, Chester, Gloucester, and Peterborough in 1541, Oxford and Bristol in 1543 ; the old abbey churches being preserved as the cathedrals. On the translation of the first bishop of Westminster to Norwich that bishopric was suppressed, thus leaving five new sees which have remained and flourished to this day. At first sight this looks like a handsome *bonus* to the National Church, but on closer consideration it appears but scant justice. Readers of the early series of ‘ Illustrated Notes ’ will have noticed that the custom of the olden time, according to the spirit of the ninth canon of the council of Hertford, was to augment the number of bishoprics as the faithful increased. But there had been no increase in the episcopate for centuries. Every effort had been made to augment the number of monasteries in order to strengthen the position of the bishop of Rome, and weaken the English Church ; and although mitred abbots were continually being created, there had not been any new bishoprics founded from the days when *Carlisle* received that honour in the reign of Henry I. In the earlier days the abbots were often selected to be bishops. When abbots came to be ranked as the social equal of a bishop there was no inducement to proceed to the higher ecclesiastical dignity. The diocesan system was therefore in danger of becoming extinct by inanition. But when the monasteries were suppressed, and the place of abbots could no longer be found, the inmates of ‘ national ’ monasteries gladly reverted to the ancient customs ; and agreed to accept positions in the cathedrals and parish churches, which they retained during the next two reigns. Here again the argument of this chapter is justified—for all the monastery churches that now became cathedral churches were of pre-Norman origin. The history of Westminster Abbey has been told in Vol. I. The early Saxon church at *Bristol* was re-constituted as an Augustinian priory at the Conquest and had continued firmly loyal to its diocesan. The growing importance of

that city and district was a sufficient reason for the new creation. Oxford Cathedral (see chap. 25) has the same tale to tell. Its stones speak to us of the Norman builders, but its history carries us far back into Saxon times, when S. Frideswide founded her nunnery at Oseney, which was supplanted by an home for Augustinian canons. That old priory of Oseney was first selected as the 'bishop's stool,' but it was very soon removed to Christchurch, as a fitting completion of the work of Cardinal Wolsey, with whom the idea of these new cathedrals originated. Oxford had earned a bishopric by the efforts the University made to clear the air when men's minds were full of doubt as to the propriety of renouncing papal supremacy; and it needed one to give *esprit de corps* to the numerous clergy and laity who were teachers and students there; but the chief reason was to relieve the diocese of Lincoln, which then extended to the Thames. *Chester Cathedral* teaches a similar lesson. A Saxon lady named Werburgh was the foundress, and it belonged to the Benedictine Order. Being situated in a part of the land that once belonged to the kingdom of Mercia, it sometimes shared with Lichfield and Coventry the honour of being an episcopal seat, long before the Tudor times. The need

for a bishopric for Chester and district will be readily granted, when it is remembered that the three large dioceses—enormous in population if not in acreage—of Ripon, Manchester, and Liverpool, have since been taken out of it. We may mention here that the Benedictine abbey of *St. Werburgh* at Chester had encroached upon the rights of the still older parochial Church of *St. Oswald*, which owed its foundation to a king of Northumbria bearing that name, who conquered the district of which Chester was the capital, long before Mercian supremacy. So too, with *Gloucester Cathedral* (see Vol. I., pages 159 and 237), which had an unbroken history as a monastery church from the



CHESTER CATHEDRAL NAVE.

year 681, when *Osríc*, an under-king of Mercia, made his sister *Kynaburg* the first Abbess. The original fabric fell a victim to the troubles that came upon the land through tribal strifes, but it was soon revived as a 'secular' college, and so remained until, in the days of Cnut the Great, Benedictine monks supplanted the secular canons. The rebuilding of the church began in the reign of Edward the Confessor, and it was completed soon after the Norman Conquest. The church has been much altered since then owing to the 'progressive' ideas of architects, but there still remains much of the early Norman church, under the 'perpendicular' casing. When the abbey was suppressed, and this was raised to cathedral rank, the inmates of surrounding 'national' monasteries were offered positions on the cathedral staff, and so we find that *John Wakeman*, the last abbot of Tewkesbury, was made the first bishop of Gloucester. *Peterborough Cathedral* (page 28) is the most notable instance of the group, for it was founded in the seventh century, in memory of *Peada's* conversion, and when its rank was changed from an abbey to a cathedral there was no alteration whatever in the *personnel*. The abbot was made the bishop, the prior became the dean, the monks became canons and choristers; so that things went on just as before. The services were said from the same service books to the same congregations, and therefore there was not only no transfer from one set of persons to another with different views, but a continuance of the same persons in the same place under reorganised and revised rules. This proves that the great body of English churchmen—clergy, monks, and laity alike—were heartily in favour of the changes that were being made to cleanse and purify the National Church from worn out rules of personal life, as well as from unauthorised and uncatholic dogma. And we cannot help perceiving that this formation of new sees was not an endowment *de novo* out of papal monasteries, but a tardy development of Saxon monasteries into the episcopal foundations they would have become centuries before had not 'foreign' influences caused the normal growth of our native episcopate to stop.

8. Monastic Churches made "Collegiate."—Our cathedral chapters have been placed in two classes, viz., those of the 'Old Foundation,' and those of the 'New Foundation.' The cathedrals of the Old foundation are those which, being served by *secular canons*, were not in the least degree interfered with by the reforms of Henry's reign, viz., Llandaff, Bangor, St. David's, St. Asaph, Lichfield, York, London, Hereford, Wells, Exeter, Salisbury, Chichester and Lincoln (all of which—except Hereford—were illustrated in our first volume). As there has never been any transference or interruption in the corporate life of those foundations, it cannot be maintained with any show of verity that the cathedral system of the National Church is modern. The cathedrals of the New

foundation are those which were originally served by *monks*, and therefore dissolved in theory at the general suppression of religious houses. They were not dissolved *in fact*, but reconstituted as chapters of secular canons. They were Canterbury, Rochester, Winchester, Worcester, Durham, Norwich, Ely and Carlisle. Almost invariably the same persons continued on as before, only under different titles. The bishops had all along been abbots *ex officio*, and sat in the abbots' seats in the chancels, the priors becoming the actual heads of the monasteries. By the new constitution the priors became deans as at Peterboro'; and the other inmates canons, precentors, choristers, &c. Again we see that there was *no transference* of property, but the same people continued to enjoy the ancient revenues belonging to their corporate body, and perform the functions to which they had been accustomed, as seculars instead of regulars. The five new sees referred to in the preceding section must be added to the cathedrals of the 'New' foundation. There were many other inmates of 'national' monasteries subject to their proper diocesan, who surrendered their houses and placed themselves at the king's disposal, who were offered positions in the cathedral and parochial systems, and the fact that very large numbers chose to accept such a change in their rules of life, shows that there was much in common between the clergy and the Benedictine monks. There had never been any difference between them as to modes of worship or fundamental doctrines. They were, and continued to be, members of one church. The most important of the communities so submitting themselves to the king's mercy were made *Collegiate bodies*. Eight of them have recently been raised to



SOUTHWELL CATHEDRAL.

cathedral rank, viz :—Ripon, Manchester, St. Albans, Truro, Liverpool, Newcastle, Southwell and Wakefield. Collegiate churches still existing are to be found at Windsor, Heytesbury, Westminster, Middleham, Wolverhampton and elsewhere, but most of the collegiate foundations have been suppressed quite lately by the powers entrusted to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The collegiate foundations of Henry VIII. were intended to take the place of the monastic colleges that were to be suppressed. But in all cases it will be found that the collegiate bodies were already in existence under another name, and that they had supplanted the older parochial clergy and used the parish church.


9. Monastic Churches now Parochial.—Nothing can be more untrue than the statement that Henry VIII. took revenues and buildings from one set of clergy and gave them to another. Such a fabrication altogether ignores the historical certainty that the parochial as well as the cathedral clergy, and their representatives in Convocation were *not interfered with* in any way. We have been considering in this chapter the dissolution of monasteries, but not the destruction of the English Church; for although monasteries had been from the earliest times a part of the



BEVERLEY MINSTER.

Church's system, it was not a vital part. But the diocesan and parochial systems were her very life-blood, her arterial and nervous organization; and as these were never intended to be interfered with, the old cathedrals and parish churches remained untouched in the days to which we have been referring. And wherever a minster church (as at Beverley or Malvern or Sherborne) remains in our possession, enquiry will show that it was originally founded long before or soon after the Norman Conquest, when as yet the bishops of Rome had not been suffered to have any jurisdiction in England. It is true that Henry VIII. made "grants" of some of these buildings, after he had first stolen them away, but it may be fairly maintained that he had no right to steal them. Moreover they were surrendered on the understanding that they should be restored—in order that they might continue to be used as the parish church. Although it is clear that valuable considerations were often given by parishioners to the king's agents for their interest in the preservation of the old Church, there is nothing

whatever to show that any free gifts of money, lands, or tithes were granted to any parish out of the exchequer. All that can be said with certainty is that parishioners were allowed to *keep their own*. Most of the Benedictine and Augustinian monasteries had grown up round or out of the ancient parish churches, which the brethren used for their devotions; or, to speak more correctly, built a suitable addition to eastward—the transepts, for example, and the chancel—the parishioners worshipping only in the nave. So we find many instances throughout the country where, while the monastic portions of the churches were destroyed and remain in ruins, the naves are still used, as they had been from the beginning, as the parish church. So it would have been at Tewkesbury, had not the parishioners bought the monastic portion of the church for £4,000; at which the commissioners estimated the value of the “superfluous buildings” on the estate. Many friends of the Church denied themselves of necessities at that time to preserve the sacred fanes of ancient ‘national’ monasteries from total destruction. St. Alban’s Abbey is another illustration in point. From the first existence of a church there the inhabitants had used the nave as their parish church; and they were allowed to retain it when the dissolution came, even as the present parishioners do, now that it has been raised to the dignity of a cathedral church.



TEWKESBURY ABBEY.

10. Educational and Charitable Foundations.—The tithes of ancient parochial churches did not all go to laymen. The king was obliged to keep up an appearance of sincerity by doing something of a charitable nature with the plunder of great monasteries, and so a few grammar schools were founded to continue educational work in places where the monks had been doing really useful work; and Trinity College was founded for Cambridge University

as Christchurch had been for Oxford. The monks and friars had supported many colleges for training youths and novices in their systems, but these were all suppressed by virtue of the statute (37 Hen. VIII., c. 4) which gave all collegiate and chantry endowments to the king. The Oxford and Cambridge colleges which survived were all founded to *exclude* monks and friars. An example of the permanent alienation of parochial tithes and the injury done thereby to parishes may be found useful. The ancient Benedictine abbey of St. Mary at York had appropriated a vast amount of tithes belonging to numerous parishes in the Northern counties. At the death of Henry VIII. the estates of that abbey were possessed by the Crown, but Queen Mary fulfilled her father's declared intention by giving them to the master and fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, *with whom they still remain*. St. Mary's abbey was obliged to provide for church services in the appropriated parishes, and they did so by appointing deputies (*Vicars*) whom they remunerated with the lesser tithes.¹ Whatever obligations were attached to the ownership of tithes by the abbey, together with its ecclesiastical patronage, continued to attach to it when transferred, first to the Crown and then to Trinity College. Kirkby Lonsdale *e.g.* was a parish so appropriated, and the gross tithes of it are now worth £1,300 year. It had been supported under the abbey by the small tithes which it has retained through all changes. These are worth about £300 a year. So that Trinity College receives about £1,000 annually from the tithes of Kirkby Lonsdale which is but one of very many parishes in its patronage. The same reasoning holds good of all other rectorial tithes now in the hands of lay corporations. The parishes are deprived of the difference between them and the vicarial tithes, which is often very considerable. Some of the monasteries had been of incalculable benefit to England in the shape of 'Hospitals.' In the present day they would be more appropriately called 'hotels' than homes for the relief of sickness. Doubtless some were exclusively for the benefit of sick folk, and two of the best—viz., St. Bartholomew's and St. Thomas's Hospitals in London—were allowed to survive the general wreck, and continue their work of mercy, though not as religious houses. They have since been greatly increased in importance and usefulness by private voluntary benevolence. In all cases where a secular foundation is said to have been founded out of the monasteries suppressed by the king it can easily be shown to be, not a new foundation out of the general fund, but an old foundation allowed to continue because it was loyal and obedient to the law. This does not apply to private charitable foundations like the *Charterhouse School*, with

1 Tithes are of two classes:—*Great* and *lesser*. The great or *Rectorial* were tithes of produce, from such things as grow out of the earth—such as corn; and the small or *Vicarial* were tithes of produce from such things as are nourished on the earth—*i.e.*, sheep, pigs, eggs, fruit, &c.

which the government had nothing whatever to do. The monastery in Goswell Street from which it takes its name belonged to the Carthusian Order. It was founded by virtue of a 'Bull' of Pope Urban VI., in the year 1360. It ceased to exist as a monastery in 1535, and the prior was executed for resisting the king's commissioners. The estates belonging to it were given by the king to the groom of his 'hales (nets) and tents.' The property was afterwards bought and sold, as any other land might be, confiscated by the Crown again because of the treason of its subsequent holders, again granted by the Crown to a nobleman, who sold it in the year 1600, for £13,000, to a London merchant, Sir Thomas Sutton, who founded a charity school for forty poor boys, and an almshouse for eighty old men. That intention 'developed' (as many old charities have done) into the great public school which has been removed to Godalming, where rich men's sons are educated. There is more than sufficient evidence in this chapter to prove that Henry VIII. did not take away the property of Romanists and bestow it upon 'Protestant' clergy. The estates possessed by upholders of papal supremacy were not transferred to the National Church at all. It was merely allowed to keep a portion of its own rightful property.

CHAPTER XIX. (A.D. 1547-1558).

THE REIGNS OF EDWARD VI. AND MARY.

"Anathemas are hurled
From both sides; veteran thunders (the brute test
Of truth) are met by fulminations new—

See Latimer and Ridley, in the might
Of Faith, stand coupled for a common flight! . . .
Earth never witnessed object more sublime
In constancy, in fellowship more fair."—*Wordsworth*.

1. The Council of Regency.—It would be better for the cause of Christian charity if we could draw a veil over many events with which this chapter has to deal; for the reigns of Edward and Mary form a decade of mutual intolerance which every one would be glad, if possible, to forget. Both were tools in the hands of their advisers. Mary studied to please her husband, and the boy king was quite at the mercy of the *Council of Regency*. Edward acceded to the throne January 28, 1547, at the age of 10, his uncle, the *Duke of Somerset*, being made Lord Protector. Somerset was the leader of the reforming section of the council, and was strongly supported

by *Archbishop Cranmer*. The opponents of Church Reform were represented by Lord Chancellor *Wriothesley*, and Cuthbert *Tonstall*, now Bishop of Durham. As the protector had a majority, he took care that the Privy Council appointed to assist the Government should be favourable to his designs, and soon found means to expel his opponents. Bishops *Gardiner* and *Bonner*, whose high positions in the councils of the late king gave them reasonable expectation of a share in the regency, found themselves altogether unnoticed; and they, with the excluded members of the council, formed an opposition party, which seems to have advised the Princess Mary; for their statements and her expressed determination on religious questions were in accord. They desired that no important alterations should be made until the young king came of age. Within the



KING EDWARD VI. IN COUNCIL.

cabinet also there was much strife and envying, and difference of opinion. Somerset did not seem to care much for religion, save that he might enrich himself at its expense; *Lord Dudley*, afterwards duke of Northumberland, was an ardent believer in the reforming opinions that were making great headway abroad; and both were ready to sacrifice Church and Realm to their own advantage. The majority of the council were in favour of increasing the power and prerogatives of the Crown, that their own delegated authority might be the greater. The first act of the council was to call upon all official persons in the realm to renew their commissions and swear allegiance, the members of it setting the example. Among them came the bishops, who again agreed to hold their sees during the

king's pleasure and perform jurisdiction in his name. During Henry's reign, and owing to the statute of the "Six Articles," the doctrines of the Church were hardly altered; but there were many persons whom it had kept in check that were prepared for the most violent extremes. Cranmer's chaplain, *Dr. Ridley*, indiscreetly suggested in a sermon that all images should be destroyed; and some zealots, estimating his words as an indication of the way the Government was tending, at once proceeded to demolish the statuary and stained glass that adorned the churches. Bishop Gardiner protested to the Protector Somerset against such outrage, and a proclamation was issued to maintain peace and protect the churches. It was soon evident that the council intended, if possible, to dictate on Church matters without reference to Convocation; but the latter upheld its dignity (November, 1547) by claiming its proper legislative functions. And none too soon: for in August, before Parliament and Convocation could meet, the council had instituted a *general visitation of England* in the king's name, providing the Commissioners with numerous *Injunctions* by which they were instructed to enquire into the religious provisions of every parish, remove any images which had been superstitiously adored, and to see that Bibles of the largest volume, together with the paraphrases of Erasmus on the Gospels, were provided in each church. The visitors were also to make provision for periodical sermons against the bishop of Rome and in favour of the king's supremacy; and other sermons once a quarter "purely and sincerely declaring the Word of God." All unlicensed preaching was forbidden; and a *Book of Homilies*, said to have been composed by Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, was ordered to be read instead. Bishops Gardiner and Bonner made energetic protests against the visitation, and were sent to prison by the council. Bonner withdrew his protest and was released; but Gardiner remained firm and was kept confined, until Parliament met in November and passed the act of general pardon in commemoration of the new king's accession.


2. **Suppression of the Chantries.**—Reference has been made (page 14) to the chantry chapels, which were built for the purpose of propitiatory services for the departed; and also (page 60) to the statute which empowered the late king to suppress them, together with other charitable foundations. Very few were suppressed before the death of Henry; but the Protector Somerset and his co-executors soon made up their minds to enrich themselves, and discharge their liabilities to the late king's creditors, by rigorously carrying out the provisions of that statute on the plea of reclaiming the funds so appropriated from superstitious uses. Soon after their first Parliament was called together they succeeded in passing a statute (1 Ed. vi., c. 14) which granted to the Crown the revenues of all 'chantries, fraternities, hospitals, and colleges' still remaining; with the exception

of the colleges at Oxford, Cambridge, Eton, and Winchester. The chief reason for the suppression of colleges, etc., was to do away with such as had been founded by the religious orders as nurseries and auxiliaries for their houses. As previously stated, all colleges which survived had been founded with the express purpose of excluding monks and friars from their benefits; but as many collegiate institutions belonging to the Seculars were also suppressed, that could not have been the only reason. With them as with the monasteries it will be found on examination that those which survived assented to the royal supremacy and the divorce of Queen Catharine, and in other ways endeavoured to advance the cause of Church Reform.¹ With reference to the statement often made that the revenues of chantries (having been bequeathed for purposes which the Church of England then and now declares blasphemous and deceitful) ought not to be held by the Church as part of her endowments; it is sufficient to say that no part of the chantry revenues came into the possession of the parochial clergy at all. It was not the practice of the time to give the Church anything, but rather to filch from it its privileges and possessions. Cranmer tried to prevent the complete alienation of the revenues, but failed. The chantry revenues were kept distinct from the parochial endowments, as the various charities in many parishes still are, so that it was an easy matter to seize upon them. Several thousand benefactions were confiscated. The Act provided that the proceeds should be used for endowing grammar schools, and increasing the incomes of vicarages which the suppression of monasteries had impoverished, but the money was applied by the council to liquidate King Henry's debts and satisfy their own cupidity. And this is not the worst. Somerset caused to be granted to himself and his immediate friends the revenues of many cathedral dignities also; and pulled down City churches, and a cloister of St. Paul's Cathedral, to obtain stone for his palace of *Somerset House*, in the Strand; and was only prevented from doing the like to Westminster Abbey by the Dean's sacrifice of half its revenues.² All these things were done by the avaricious councillors in the name of the royal supremacy, without any apparent apprehension of the difference between things sacred and profane. The principle that guided them is called *Erastianism*; after a Swiss physician named Erastus, who a little later on boldly denied the Divine organisation of Christ's Church, and held it to be a mere creature of the state; dependent thereon for its existence and authority. While the highest officers in the realm were wantonly destroying and appropriating holy things, we cannot wonder at the sacrilegious acts recorded of the people. The marble coffins in which people had been buried were made into troughs for horses to drink from, altar cloths and vest-

¹ See, e.g., Professor Burrows' *Worthies of All Souls' College, Oxford*. Macmillan.

² Somerset House was rebuilt in 1775.

ments were adapted to domestic purposes, and the eucharistic vessels used for ordinary eating and drinking. It was a harvest time for thieves and a high holiday for the profane. Later in the reign things went from bad to worse. The episcopal manors were seized upon by a system of forced exchanges, to the great impoverishment of the sees; patrons of benefices, and impropiators of tithes, withheld the incomes of vicars; and on a weak pretence the Protector Northumberland appropriated the whole revenues of the bishopric of Durham. Ultimately a regular plan was formulated for defrauding the episcopate; but the young king had by that time begun to take a more responsible part in the conduct of affairs and it was vetoed



GREAT HALL OF CHRIST'S HOSPITAL.

He said: "You have had among you the abbeys, which you have consumed in superfluous apparel and dice and cards, and now you would have the bishops' lands and revenues to abuse likewise! Set your hearts at rest; there shall no such alteration take place while I live." In consequence of a sermon by Bishop Ridley, Edward was led before his death to do something for the London poor. In conjunction with the Lord Mayor a comprehensive scheme was drawn up to relieve some of their wants. The Grey Friars monastery in what is now Newgate Street was converted into the school called *Christ's Hospital* for the children of the poor, St. Bartholomew's

and St. Thomas's Hospitals were reconstituted with augmented endowments to relieve the sick poor, and the royal palace of *Bridewell* was turned into a house of correction for the vagabond poor. Edward VI. also established twenty-two grammar schools in various parts of the country, now known as the "King's" schools, or King Edward VI.'s schools—as at Birmingham. Schools were naturally suggested as an appropriate way of spending some of the money that came into his hands from suppressed colleges and chantries, for the chantry priests were often engaged in tuition of the village children to fill up their time and increase their income.

3. The Liturgy.¹—Amid the prevalent cupidity and irreverent sacrilege it is cheering to find that solid and lasting work was done by the committee appointed by Convocation, in 1542, to revise and translate the ancient service books. The first Convocations of Edward's reign met in 1547, and at once proceeded to the Eucharist controversy by condemning the practice of withholding the chalice from the laity, and advising Parliament to pass a statute (1 Ed. VI., c. 1) to enforce Communion in both kinds. The resolution passed Convocation November 30, and the bill received royal assent December 10. A committee of Convocation under Archbishop Cranmer had been engaged since 1546 in a revision of the Latin *Missal*, and a form for the Communion service was issued in March 1548. It left the old Latin service intact up to the reception of the elements by the celebrant, but added an English form for the communion of the people in both kinds. Its use dated from Easter 1548. This was only a tentative arrangement, for later in the year the committee which had been working since 1542 submitted the result of their labours to Convocation in the form of the *First English Prayer Book*.² This was quickly approved, and an Act of Uniformity applied for from Parliament to enforce its use in all churches on and after the following Whit Sunday. It passed the Houses by January 21, and received the royal assent just before Edward had completed the second year of his reign (2 & 3 Ed. VI., c. 1). Archbishop Cranmer was the chief of the revising committee, and spared no pains to obtain the opinions of all sections of reforming divines at home and abroad as aids to its discussions. "The principles which guided the Prayer-book revisers were very simple. In doctrinal matters they took for their standard of orthodoxy the Bible, and the belief of the Church for the first five centuries; in framing formularies for the

1 The word Liturgy is here used loosely for the Prayer-book in general, although it strictly belongs to the Communion Office. For further study of the Liturgy see Canon Daniel's *History of the Prayer-book*.—Wells Gardner—Price 6s.; and the *Prayer-book Commentary*, S.P.C.K., 1s.

2 Reprints have been published of both the Edwardian English Prayer-books, by Parker and Co. and Griffith and Farran, at 1s. each.

conduct of public worship, they retained whatsoever they could of the old service-books ; in ritual matters they continued to follow the traditions of their own Church, deviating from them only where spiritual edification rendered such deviation necessary. Their object was not to revolutionise, but to reform ; not to get as far away as possible from the Church of Rome, or from any other Church, but by retracing the steps whereby the primitive Church of England had 'fallen from herself,' to return to Catholic faith and practice." (*E. Daniel*). A complete contemporary statement of the revisers' motives may be found in the chapter entitled "Concerning the Service of the Church" at the beginning of our present Prayer-book, which was the preface to the first English book ; and in the following chapter 'Of Ceremonies,' then printed at the end of the book. The new Prayer-book was not acceptable to many parish priests ;—least of all to those who had sometime been inmates of religious houses, some of whom were quite untrained for pastoral work, and therefore not properly qualified for the position—and those who disapproved of any alteration in the conventional way of conducting public worship stirred up ill feeling against the book by an irreverent and ludicrous sing-song rendering of it, so that people thought it was 'like a Christmas game.' It wanted very little then to make the working classes express discontent. The large demand for wool had turned the greater part of England into sheep farms, thus reducing the amount of field labour ; and wages were paid in the debased coin of Henry's reign, which advanced the price of vital necessaries. We read therefore of rebellions in the eastern counties and the west of England, in which social and religious grievances were curiously mixed up. The Devonshire rebels petitioned for the suppression of the Bible, and the continuance of the old Latin services ; until Cranmer explained that the new book was only the ancient services in an English dress. The East Anglian rising was quelled by Lord Dudley, and the Western rebellion by Lord Russell ; but not without much difficulty and bloodshed, and the hanging of the ringleaders ; with which however the Church had nothing to do. Protector Somerset was then impeached for encouraging the rebels, and mal-administration generally ; and was succeeded by the Duke of Northumberland. The great body of clergy and people had welcomed the appearance of the first English Prayer-book ; but in order to give effect to the Act of Uniformity a second visitation was ordered by the council in the Autumn of 1549. The instructions to the commissioners plainly shewed that the leanings of the new protector were in favour of a still more rapid and vigorous reform, in the direction of the most Calvinistic ideas, and when bishops and clergy of the "old learning" declined to conform to the new demands, on the ground that the council had no right to exercise the royal supremacy during the king's minority, they were deprived and imprisoned. The jurisdiction of bishops was suspended during both these visitations.

4. The Edwardian Bishops.—The second Act of Parliament passed in Edward's reign (1 Ed. VI., c. 2) had interfered with the customary method of appointing bishops, by abolishing the *congé d'élire* hitherto granted to cathedral chapters, and enacting that all bishops should be consecrated on receipt of "royal letters patent" solely. The Act also provided that all episcopal acts pertaining to jurisdiction should be done in the king's name; and declared the episcopal office to be tenable during the king's pleasure only, or during good behaviour, instead of during life as formerly. Under these new powers the council was able to deprive all bishops who were not willing to sanction its policy or proceedings. The first Prayer-book contained no services for ordination, but the old Pontificals



ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

(page 39) were revised and translated by a committee of twelve, six being bishops, and their work was completed by February, 1550. In most things that are done by committees a minority decline to give unqualified assent to all details of the work; and when the new Ordinal was laid before the council, *Nicholas Heath*, bishop of Worcester, expressed his disagreement with some things his colleagues had inserted or omitted; though he promised to obey its provisions. In modern times his objection would hardly have been noticed, but then the council put him in prison; another bishop, *George Day* of Chichester, being sent to keep him company for objecting to use either the Ordinal or the Prayer-book. Both these bishops were deprived under the above statute by a joint commission of clergy and laity; Day's place being taken by John Scory (1552), and the see of Worcester given to John Hooper, to hold in commendam with that of Gloucester. Several other bishops were deprived for resisting the council, viz:—*Edmund Bonner*, bishop of London (1550), whose place was filled by Nicholas Ridley, translated from Rochester; *Stephen Gardiner*, bishop of Winchester (1551), who was succeeded by John Poynt, also translated from Rochester; *Cuthbert Tunstall*, bishop of Durham, whose place was not filled up because the revenues of the see had been confiscated by the Protector; and *John Voysey*, bishop of Exeter, who resigned his see to his suffragan Miles Coverdale in 1551, and was imprisoned for alleged complicity in the

Devonshire rebellion. Gardiner and Tonstall were sent to the Tower, Bonner to the Marshalsea prison, Heath and Day to the Fleet. Other bishops appointed through ordinary vacancies in Edward's reign were Robert Ferrar to St. David's, 1548, and John Taylor to Lincoln, 1552; the other translations being William Barlow from St. Asaph to Bath and Wells, 1548, Thomas Thirlby from Westminster to Norwich, 1550, and Henry Holbeach from Rochester to Lincoln in 1547. Much trouble was caused when Hooper was appointed by the council to the see of Gloucester in 1550. He had been a Cistercian monk, but accepted reformation principles at the dissolution. During the reaction at the close of Henry's reign he took refuge with Calvin at Geneva, and imbibed the revolutionary ideas of the latter. On his return he became noted for extreme opinions, and it was much against Cranmer's wish that he was nominated to the bishopric. When the time came for consecration Hooper declined to be robed as the Ordinal directed, on the ground that all vestments were superstitious, and "relics of Judaism." The council wanted Cranmer to consecrate without them, but the primate declined. Every effort was made to change the mind of the obstinate nominee, but in vain. He was therefore ordered to keep his house, and abstain from preaching or publishing anything. He treated the order with contempt, and suffered for his folly by being committed to the Fleet prison. Two months' confinement was more efficacious than all the arguments, and he was consecrated in full canonicals March, 1551. The Six Articles Statute of Henry's reign had withdrawn the permission for Clergy to marry; but it was repealed, with other repressive measures, by 1 Ed. VI., c. 12. Convocation obtained a new act (2 Ed. VI., c. 21), permitting but discouraging clerical matrimony, which was rendered less objectionable by a further act later on (5 and 6 Ed. VI., c. 12). A large number of clergy and most bishops availed themselves of the privilege, but their wives were very lightly esteemed by the public.

5. Foreign Religious Reformers.—England soon became a home of refuge for foreign 'Protestants.' The church of the Austin Friars, in the city of London, exempted from the general destruction of foreign monasteries, was given to exiled *Dutch Reformers*, who were presided over by *John A' Lasco*; the Crypt of Canterbury Cathedral was appropriated to refugees from France under the same presidency; and part of Glastonbury Abbey was appropriated to some German exiles, under *Pollanus* of Strasburg. Besides these protected congregations there were many objectionable theorists, like the Anabaptists who had wrought much mischief at Münster, who were regarded as dangerous. *Anabaptists* denied the Godhead of our Lord, and refused baptism to infants. They were not much interfered with until it was found that their lawless social tenets brought scandal on religion. Then several were arrested and arraigned, notably *Joan Bouchier*, who was brought before

the Council and condemned for denying the Saviour's Incarnation. As she obstinately refused to recant the young king was prevailed upon to sign a warrant for her to be burnt. A special warrant was needed for this, because the statutes relating to the punishment of heresy had been repealed at the beginning of the reign. Although burning was the common punishment for heresy in all European countries at that time, this recurrence to it under Cranmer's primacy is much to be deplored. Not long after, another Anabaptist, *George Van Parre*, suffered a similar fate. Cranmer persuaded the king to sign the warrants for their execution by pointing out that their opinions were blasphemy against God, and direct denials of the Apostles' Creed. Besides the refugees there were many learned reformers, specially invited to this country by Cranmer, on account of their eminence in dealing with the controversies of the time. In a letter to one of them Cranmer states his motives thus :—


"I considered it better, forasmuch as our adversaries are now holding their councils at Trent to confirm their errors, to recommend his majesty to grant his assistance, that in England, or elsewhere, there might be convoked a synod of the most learned and excellent persons; in which provision might be made for the purity of ecclesiastical doctrine, and especially for an agreement upon the sacramentarian controversy."

The synod was never held, but there were several public disputations at Oxford and Cambridge respecting the nature of the presence of Christ in the elements of the Eucharist. Three of the foreigners whom Cranmer invited are specially noteworthy. One of them was an Italian named *Peter Martyr*. He had been an Augustinian friar, and had married an escaped nun. The regency made him Regius professor of divinity at Oxford in 1547. The second was a German named *Martin Bucer*. He had been a Dominican friar, and now obtained the Regius professorship of divinity at Cambridge. He came in 1548, but had retained the position only two years when he died. He was buried with much honour in St. Mary's Church at Cambridge, the whole university attending his funeral. The third was *John A'Lasco*, a Polish nobleman, who had great influence over Cranmer, and became a sort of bishop to the refugee communities. Without presuming to throw doubt upon the learning or integrity of these men, it is matter for devout thankfulness, both that their influence went as far as it did, and that it stopped where it did. In a sense the English and Continental reformations went hand in hand, and each gave mutual help and strength to the other; but many of the foreign reformers were rash and obtrusive men who seemed unable to distinguish Catholic faith and practice from papal and mediæval accretions thereto. Those who settled in England were much dissatisfied with the limited extent of the changes made in the new English Liturgy. In deference to their objections steps were taken to revise it. Bucer

and Martyr made a formal report of their criticisms and suggestions, but as the points objected to were not altered in quite the way desired by them after all, it is clear that the divines appointed by Convocation to revise the book did not intend to follow their lead blindly. An indication of the *direction* taken by the revisers may be seen in the change of words appointed for use in administering the consecrated elements to communicants. The first book contained only the first-part of the words now used—down to ‘everlasting life’—which imply the efficacious aspect of the service; but when the revised book was published and authorised in October, 1551, it was found that the old words had been *exchanged* for the second part of those now used—beginning ‘take and eat,’ and ‘drink this,’ &c.—from a liturgy compiled by John A’ Lasco—which indicate its memorial

aspect only. The second book abolished also the ancient vestments and ornaments of the churches allowed in the first book, and substituted the word ‘table’ for ‘altar.’ This last was due doubtless to the influence of Bishop Ridley, who in his episcopal visitations had caused the altars to be substituted by tables in the body of the churches. John A’ Lasco would have gone further, and made communicants sit instead of kneel to receive. For the other and numerous changes the reader must refer to works dealing specially with the Liturgy. The Act of Uni-

formity (5 & 6 Ed. VI., c. 1) enforcing the use of this *Second Liturgy of Edward VI.* was not passed until April, 1552, nor was it to come into use until November, 1552; and as no order was made to destroy or call in copies of the first book it is not probable that the second one came into general use before King Edward died.



ST. MARY'S CHURCH, CAMBRIDGE.

6. The Succession to the Throne.—The king's sisters, Mary and Elizabeth, were sorely tried during the protectorates of Somerset and Northumberland. All Henry's children were by different wives; Mary being the daughter of Catharine of Arragon, Elizabeth of Anne Boleyn, and Edward of Jane Seymour. Elizabeth's tutor was

Dr. Matthew Parker, and he advised her to conciliate the council by conforming to the authorised services. But Mary was no longer under tutelage, and resolutely declined to forsake her cradle faith; she having been brought up by her mother in the most rigorous Spanish fashion to believe in the spiritual and temporal autocracy of the pope. The council tormented her by sending all manner of men to argue with her upon doctrine, but she would listen to none; reserving her judgment until her brother came of age. But Edward sickened and was like to die; and Northumberland saw that the accession of Mary in right of her father's will would mean the overthrow of himself, his family, and the reforming principles which he had so assiduously instilled into the young king's mind. He had married his son Lord Guildford Dudley to the *Lady Jane Grey*; granddaughter of Edward's aunt, Mary Tudor; and hoped to retain power by securing the throne for his daughter-in-law. Henry had arranged by his will that the succession should pass to the children of Mary Tudor, *failing* any heirs to his daughters Mary and Elizabeth when they in turn succeeded to the throne; but the ambitious protector fomented King Edward's religious susceptibilities until he agreed to *alter the succession* by passing over his half-sisters in immediate favour of Lady Jane Grey, without the consent of Parliament such as Henry was careful to obtain, thus violating the Constitution. Edward died July 6, 1553. Two days later, and much against her will, Northumberland proclaimed Lady Jane as queen. Mary at once summoned her friends and marched to London, being received everywhere with enthusiasm. Daily her adherents increased and Northumberland's waned. Then came a stern reaction. Northumberland was arrested and beheaded forthwith; his *protégés* being sent to the Tower. The position of ecclesiastical parties was thus entirely reversed; for as Mary had been closely associated with the party that professed to believe in papal supremacy, it naturally took the place of Edward's government.

8. The Marian Bishops.—But all the early proceedings of Mary's reign were done according to laws made and examples set in the previous reign. The measures framed by Edward's council to suppress opponents were now turned against the men that made them. The six imprisoned bishops were at once released from confinement as an act of royal clemency. The next business was to restore them to the sees of which they had been deprived by the council. This was done by a lay commission; which deprived in turn the bishops by whom they had been supplanted. The same commission dispossessed all other clergy who had been appointed by Edward's council to benefices made vacant by its deprivation of incumbents who were still alive; especially those in high office.

Here it should be remembered that *Convocation* consists chiefly of dignitaries: the "Upper Houses" of bishops only; and the "Lower

Houses" of deans, archdeacons, and proctors elected by the cathedral chapters and by the clergy. But the proctors of the clergy have always been in a great minority; *e.g.*—the diocesan representation in either lower house of Convocation consists of the dean, two or three archdeacons (these are *ex-officio*), and one proctor elected by the chapter from its other members; while the other clergy of the diocese are only allowed to elect two representatives; so that the representatives of the chapter outnumber the representatives of the parochial clergy by two to one. Convocation is summoned concurrently with Parliament and a general election of proctors takes place at the same time as the general election of members to Parliament. In the despotic days of which we are treating, when there was very little freedom of election and many "pocket boroughs," it was comparatively easy for the Crown and Privy Council to ensure the return to Parliament of a majority favourable to their policy. It was easier still to pack Convocation with subservient members; for the bishops, deans and other dignitaries were Crown appointments; and therefore a despotic monarch was able to keep matters firmly within grasp on seemingly constitutional lines; especially as the irresponsible power accorded to kings by the acts of supremacy enabled them to incarcerate and to punish all who resisted them.

Mary's first Parliament did not meet until October 5, 1553; and in the meantime occasion had been found, in spite of Mary's promise before her accession not to compel any change in religion, by which those who favoured the ecclesiastical proceedings of the late reign were prevented from appearing in Convocation. A fanatic threw a dagger at one of the queen's chaplains who preached at St. Paul's Cross against the reformed service books. This gave the queen excuse to issue a proclamation forbidding all unlicensed preaching which might cause dissension "until such time as further order by common consent may be taken therein." This order was disobeyed by the leading preachers among the reformers, and they were at once arrested and confined. The prelates Cranmer and Ridley had preached strongly in favour of the Lady Jane and were sent to the Tower as traitors "until further order;" Hugh Latimer, who had resigned his bishopric of Worcester in Henry's reign through dissatisfaction with the "Six Articles Statute," and had refused to resume possession on the deprivation of Heath—preferring to spend his time in what we should now call mission preaching throughout the country—was imprisoned for "seditious demeanour;" Bishops Hooper and Coverdale following him for preaching without licenses, as did many others of lesser degree. The foreign reformers were ordered to quit the country with their congregations; which they made haste to do, accompanied by many of the English clergy and laity who feared that the prominent parts they took in Church reform would bring them into personal danger. No one was prevented from leaving England. The Government desired to silence opposition, and

if the reformers did not care for voluntary exile occasion was sought to put them under ward. Stephen Gardiner, the restored bishop of Winchester, was now made lord chancellor; while the restored bishops of London and Durham obtained seats in the Privy Council. When Parliament met it declined to repeal *en bloc* the religious statutes of Henry and Edward relating to religion and the divorce at the bidding of the council, but it ultimately agreed (1 Mary c. 2) to repeal the ecclesiastical laws of Edward's reign, and legitimate Mary by annulling Queen Catharine's divorce (1 Mary c. 1). This brought Church affairs back to the position they had occupied at the close of King Henry's reign, but *did not restore papal supremacy*. For nearly two years the royal writs ran thus:—"Mary, by the grace of God, *Supreme Head on earth* of the Church of England." The repeal of the Edwardian statutes abolished the English Service-books in favour of the old Latin Missals, Breviaries, etc., and restored the Six Articles Act which enforced clerical celibacy. A very large number of bishops and clergy were thus brought within the power of the council, and the Archbishop of York (Holgate), with Bishops Birde of Chester, Buche of Bristol—all appointed in Henry's reign—and Ferrar of St. David's, were immediately deprived for having contracted matrimonial alliances. Bishop Hooper, of Gloucester and Worcester; Bishop Skip, of Hereford; and Bishop Taylor, of Lincoln; were also deposed—because they had been consecrated by "letters patent" instead of being elected by the chapters. New bishops were then elected by *congés d'elire* to fill their places, who were prepared to deprive all clergy in their dioceses that were amenable to the revived laws, in accordance with the injunctions issued by Queen and Council by virtue of the royal supremacy. The First fruits and Tenths, which Henry had appropriated to the Crown, were soon ordered to be repaid to Rome as formerly; and it is but just to Mary to point out that she restored the greater part of Church lands and revenues that remained in the hands of the Crown.

9. The Spanish Match.—It was soon known that Mary had covenanted to marry her cousin *Philip*, who was heir to the Spanish throne. This union was distasteful to the general public; and in January, 1554, *Sir Thomas Wyatt* roused the men of Kent, who marched to London with the intention of seizing the queen's person, and so prevent the project being carried out. The Duke of Suffolk was concerned in this rebellion, which gave rise to a suspicion that the restoration of his daughter, Lady Jane Grey, was its real object. Others suggested that it was on behalf of *Princess Elizabeth*. Suffolk, Lady Jane, and her husband Lord Guildford Dudley, were all beheaded; and Wyatt was tortured to make him implicate the Princess, who was arrested and taken to the Tower. Wyatt afterwards withdrew the false accusations forced from him under torture, and was executed; four hundred of his adherents suffering in like

manner. The most astonishing facts in those dark days was the eager study of religious questions by the nobility, and the way both sides "searched the Scriptures" to find authority for their deeds. A persecuting spirit was abroad, life was accounted of far less value than now, and the leaders of each party, believing that the Word of God was in their favour, went cheerfully to imprisonment, exile and death for the cause they represented. Princess Elizabeth was considered a dangerous rival to Mary, especially as it was known she favoured the religious opinions current during Edward's reign, and therefore she was kept confined. Bishops Gardiner, Bonner, and Toustal tried to induce her to accept the papal interpretation respecting



ELIZABETH EXAMINED BY TONSTAL, BONNER, AND GARDINER.

the mode of our Lord's presence in the elements of bread and wine at Holy Communion, but she was very diplomatic in her replies. A famous verse has been attributed to her authorship in this connexion :—

"Christ was the Word that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it,
And what the Word did make it,
That I believe and take it."

It is said that Elizabeth owed her release from the Tower to Philip, who dreaded to leave England open to French and Scottish

intrigues. But she was kept a close prisoner at Woodstock and Hatfield, and compelled to conform to her sister's mode of worship. Mary's marriage took place in July, 1554, and very soon the worst fears of the nation were realised; for her husband was a stern, callous, and implacable man, who upheld the enormities of the *Spanish Inquisition*—whose *autos-da-fé*¹ had filled all Europe with horror—and only professed clemency to a few that he might be able to throw the blame of many deaths on others. He brought with him a number of Romish clergy whose special mission was to reduce England to papal obedience and promote the extirpation of "heretics." One of them became the queen's confessor, and others succeeded the foreign reformers as professors in the universities. Writings of the old schoolmen like *St. Thomas Aquinas* were made the subjects of study, in place of the classics and Early Christian Fathers introduced by Colet and Erasmus; and steps were taken to obtain legal sanction for extreme measures against the imprisoned bishops and clergy, by repealing all acts relating to the royal supremacy and reviving the statutes passed against the Lollards in the reign of Henry IV.


10. **Reconciliation with Rome.**—The difficulty in the way was the dissolution and plunder of the monasteries. So many nobles and merchants held monastic lands that Parliament refused all advances made to it by Philip and Mary for reconciliation with the pope until the latter consented to confirm the alienation, transfer and sale of monastic lands to their present possessors. Mary had personally submitted herself to the pope soon after her accession, and *Cardinal Pole*, whom the pope had deputed to "represent" England at the Council of Trent (notwithstanding that he was an outlaw and a traitor to his king), was nominated extraordinary legate to this country. But neither Parliament nor the council, of which Bishop Gardiner was chief, would consent to his landing in England so long as the bishop of Rome declined to confirm the disposition of monastic estates, and the rights of patronage acquired thereby. At length the pope yielded the desired point, and Cardinal Pole entered England as plenipotentiary, November 24, 1554. By that time there was a new Parliament, and consequently a new Convocation, much more subservient than the last. These were required by the queen to desire reconciliation and pardon from the legate, requests most graciously accorded by him, the members humbly kneeling to receive absolution. As was hoped by the queen Parliament showed its gratitude by repealing all the acts of Henry's reign subsequent to 1534 directed against the papal supremacy; but the legislature was shrewd enough to insert in the Statute of Repeal (1 & 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8) the provisions of the legate

1 A Portuguese phrase meaning an act of faith—deriv. fr. "Auto"—(Lat. *actus*) an act; "da"—(Lat. *de*) of; and "fe"—(Lat. *fides*) faith—applied to the ceremony of burning heretics.

dispensation, which confirmed the titles to ecclesiastical property, in spite of all Pole's efforts to dissociate the subjects. By that act the statutes against Lollards were revived, and very soon enforced. The following bishops were appointed commissioners to try all persons suspected of heresy: Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, president; Tonstall, bishop of Durham; Thirlby, bishop of Norwich; Aldridge, bishop of Carlisle; and Bonner, bishop of London; all of whom were consecrated in the reign of Henry VIII. The trials took place in St. Saviour's Church, Southwark. The new Convocation put forth three propositions as *the test of heresy*; and if the accused would not allow them to be true they were forthwith condemned—if they were in holy orders they were also degraded from their office—and then handed over to the secular arm. The triple test was: (1) Whether the natural Body of Christ be really present under the species of bread and wine by virtue of the consecrating words spoken by the priest; (2) Whether the substances of bread and wine cease to exist after consecration; and (3) Whether the Mass be a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead. Unless the accused were prepared to give affirmative replies to each, and accept the pope's supremacy, they had not much hope of life. No excuse was allowed on the score of illiterateness; nor did old age, youth, or sex excite pity or pardon.

11. **The Marian Persecutions.**—The first four to be arraigned before the commissioners were *John Hooper*, Bishop of Gloucester; *John Rogers* (otherwise Mathews), who had translated the "Mathew's Bible" and was then canon of St. Paul's and vicar of St. Sepulchre's, London; *Laurence Saunders*, sometime vicar of Coventry; and *Dr. Rowland Taylor*, parson of Hadleigh, in Suffolk. They were all condemned for denying "Transubstantiation," and they were sentenced to be burnt in the places where they had ministered, in order that their parishioners and people might be terrified into renouncing the opinions they had learned from the condemned teachers. But this arrangement had a directly contrary effect. The condemned divines met their deaths so bravely that bystanders felt that their constancy could only proceed from an ardent conviction that the doctrines for which they suffered were true. Several contemporary accounts exist of those times, written by independent observers of high character who were in no way prejudiced in favour of the reformers, which help us to understand what really happened; e.g., The French ambassador, *Noailles*, who witnessed the martyrdom of Canon Rogers at Smithfield, records against the date, February 4, 1555:—"This day was celebrated the confirmation of the alliance between the pope and this kingdom, by the public and solemn sacrifice of a doctor and preacher named Rogers, who was burned alive for holding Lutheran opinions, persisting till death in his sentiments. At this constancy the people were so

delighted that they feared not to strengthen his courage by their acclamations, even his own children joining, and consoling him after such a fashion that it seemed as if they were conducting him to his nuptials."¹



BISHOP HOOPER.

Bishop Hooper was sent to Gloucester and suffered on February 9. "A great wind blew while he was burning, and hindered the flame to rise up and choke him, or destroy his vitals, so that he was near three-quarters-of-an-hour in great torment."² Dr. Taylor was burnt in his parish on the same day, confirming many of his people by his courageous demeanour;³ and Mr. Saunders displayed equal constancy at Coventry the day before. *Bishop Ferrar*, of St. David's, was burnt in the market place of Carmarthen on March 30. "He had told a gentleman of his acquaintance that if he saw him in the least degree shrink when in the flames, he might freely disbelieve all the doctrines which he had taught. No such shrinking was discernible, although his sufferings were greatly prolonged."⁴ Bishop Gardiner hoped that these five examples would terrify the people into submission and appease the appetite of the court. He was mistaken in both suppositions; for the reformers were eager to testify their faith in their blood, and the council pressed the bishops to be more zealous in seeking out suspected heretics. Gardiner and Tonstall declined to imbrue their hands further, so they resigned their seats on the commission; and the presidency of it fell to Bonner, bishop of London, who seemed determined not to be accused of slackness in the matter; for the summaries made of the total burnings during Mary's reign in England and Wales, credit the diocese of London with 123 victims out of a total of 286! Canterbury diocese (Cardinal Pole's) contributed fifty-five, and the diocese of Norwich (Bishop Hopton's) forty-six.⁵ There were no burnings in the dioceses of Lincoln, Durham, Carlisle, Bath and Wells, Hereford or Worcester. The chief place among the martyrs must always be accorded to Archbishop Craumer, and Bishops Latimer and Ridley, because of their prominent work in guiding the reforms of Edward's reign and framing the English Service books. No one had power to condemn the archbishop and metropolitan except the pope, because he had been appointed by papal bulls. (See page 34). All three prelates

1 Quoted in "Perry's Student's Church History," Volume 2.

2 Burnet's History of the Reformation.

3 On a stone erected at the spot may still be seen "1555, D. Tayler in defending that was good, At this place left his blode."

4 Student's Church History, Vol. 2.

5 The summaries that have been made of the total number burnt do not agree. Many of the sufferers were women, and some were children.

had been imprisoned in Oxford since the autumn of 1553 they having been sent there to have their tenets confuted publicly by Romanist divines; but on September 30th, 1555, Latimer and Ridley were brought out for trial. After a brief disputation they were condemned to die together. The story of their sufferings has been told so often, that we need not tell it again at any length. The stake was erected opposite Balliol College, and they were fastened to it back to back by a single chain. A relative of Bishop Ridley provided bags of gunpowder to hang round their necks to shorten their agony. Honest old Latimer, who never once wavered through all these troubled times; and had never ceased to denounce unsparingly every species of vice, especially vice in high places, which caused some to give him the distinguishing title of the apostle of the reformation; ended his life in a characteristic way. As soon as the faggots were lighted he cheered his partner with the ever memorable prophecy "Be of good comfort Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out." He had hardly time to commend his soul to God before the flames reached the powder, and his sufferings were over. But the same wind which carried the flames to Latimer blew them away from Ridley, and the faggots would not burn. His feet and legs were roasted but his vitals were untouched. A friend piled on more wood, but that only choked the flame; and not until a bystander stirred the heap of embers did the flames reach the gunpowder and end his pain. Archbishop Cranmer was not put to death until the following year. He alone of all the reformers loved his life more than his faith. His action was fearful and fitful all through.

"Like a poor bird entangled in a snare,
Whose heart still flutters, though his wings forbear
To stir in useless struggle."

He was persuaded over and over again by his enemies to believe that a pardon would be granted if he would recant certain passages in his writings and public disputations. The Romanists felt that if the leader of the Reformation could be induced to deny its principles a fatal blow would be struck against it. No less than seven different documents were signed by Cranmer, each more galling and humiliating than their predecessors, until he had admitted himself to be everything that was vile. But the pardon for which he looked came not. They told him it should be given publicly, after a public recantation. He agreed to that also, but it did not fall out as intended by his foes



LATIMER AND RIDLEY.

On Saturday, March 21, 1556, a wet and stormy day, he was conducted through the streets of Oxford to St. Mary's Church; but when the time for recantation came he surprised the congregation and his enemies by repudiating all his previous recantations, and declared that the hand which signed them should burn first when they brought him to the stake. His revengeful persecutors were bitterly mortified, and hurried him out of the church to the pyre hard by, where his fellow-bishops had suffered six months before; and there, true to his promise, when the flames were kindled, Cranmer held his right hand over them until it was entirely consumed; repeating all the while "this unworthy hand." The next day Cardinal Pole was appointed to the primacy thus rendered vacant. The papal bull containing Cranmer's sentence declared that he was condemned "for bringing in the false and heretical doctrines of Wycliffe and Luther." The burnings continued until the end of the reign, and with increasing bitterness; any expressions of pity for the victims from bystanders being prohibited by proclamation. The last human sacrifice of this reign was offered at Canterbury, in November, 1558, when five persons were immolated. They prayed when at the stake that they might be the last so executed, and their prayers were answered. These executions did more than anything else to make Englishmen execrate everything that harmonised with the Church of Rome, and heap infamy on Queen Mary; who saw too late that it was impossible to quench a movement which had been growing and strengthening for generations. It will not do to try and account for the struggle on political or patriotic grounds, connected with the question of papal supremacy, merely. It was far more than that; for many persons were burnt solely because of their opinions on matters of faith and ritual, and died in the belief that they were witnessing to Truth, restoring worship to primitive simplicity, and setting Apostolic doctrine free from the bondage of superstition. Yet it cannot be forgotten that each party which came into power adopted similar methods of repressing those who opposed its religious policy.

12. The Exiled Reformers.—We must now follow those who escaped in the early part of the reign from these dire persecutions. Many fled to France and Geneva, but most to Frankfort. They included several bishops, viz.: *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Poynet*, consecrated in Edward's reign; and *Barlow*, bishop of Bath and Wells, who was consecrated in the reign of Henry VIII. There were several deans and archdeacons besides, and many learned clergy who afterwards became eminent such as *Jewel*, *Knox*, *Grindal* and others; besides a large number of influential laymen with their families. All were prominent persons connected with the Reformation, otherwise their escape would not have been necessary. They were a mixed company with diverse opinions and could neither agree among themselves or live at peace among those who sheltered them. Some

desired to use the English service books, others did not; and the Frankfort settlement was marred by such sharp contentions that the magistracy had to interfere. The chief antagonists were John Knox and Dr. Cox, and the dispute ended by the expulsion of Knox from the city. These '*Troubles of Frankfort*' sowed the

seed of much recrimination afterwards; especially as each section of the exiles, in one city or another, had no determined opinions as to discipline or ceremonial; for some became Zwinglian, others Lutheran, some Anabaptists and others Calvinistic, and each intolerant of its neighbour. In England meanwhile Cardinal Pole had instituted a general visitation of the dioceses and universities (1557) for the extermination of all books and relics of the reformers. At Cambridge Bucer's bones were exhumed, and burnt upon a pile of his books. Peter Martyr's wife had died during his residence at Oxford, and her bones were taken from the consecrated ground in which they had been laid, and buried in



MARTYRS' MEMORIAL, OXFORD.

a dunghill as a perjured *religieuse*. The *Jesuit Fathers* much wished to make this country a happy hunting ground for their system, but Cardinal Pole objected to their ways. This brought the enmity of Rome upon him, and his legatine commission was revoked, *Cardinal Peto* being appointed in his stead. Queen Mary resented this action of the pope and threatened to punish Peto under the old statutes of *Præmunire* if he ventured to land in England as legate! So that even in Mary's submissive reign the pope's authority was not quite absolute. Mary died November 17, 1558, of a broken heart; brought on by her husband's neglect, the loss of Calais, and the failure of her religious projects. Within the next 24 hours Cardinal Pole died also. Princess Elizabeth at once assumed sovereignty; and again the political and religious affairs of the country underwent a revolution.

CHAPTER XX.

UNDER THE VIRGIN QUEEN.

"All hail, sage lady, whom a grateful isle
 Hath blest, respiring from that dismal war
 Stilled by thy voice! But quickly from afar
 Defiance breathes with more malignant aim;
 And alien storms with home-bred ferments claim
 Portentous fellowship." — *Wordsworth.*

1. **Restoration of the Royal Supremacy.**—The new queen began her reign warily, and there were no sudden changes. Many counsellors of the late reign were retained to advise and direct, and the bishops escorted her from Highgate to London amid the acclamations of the people! At the same time it was so very well known that Elizabeth had inherited a preference for the reformers, that the exiles trooped back merrily; accompanied by many indiscreet persons who determined to overthrow by violence all religious ceremonies, and set up modes of worship according to their own sweet will. But their innovations and iconoclasm were promptly suppressed. A proclamation was issued (December 27) forbidding any kind of service other than that which was issued at the close of Henry's reign until the three estates of the realm could be called together to advise. This proclamation reassured disquieted minds and probably prevented a revolution. In due course Elizabeth's accession was notified to the various courts of Europe including that of Pope Paul IV.; but the latter replied in insolent terms that England was a fief of the Papacy, and that Elizabeth had no right to assume royal sway without his authority; adding that as her mother's marriage was invalid she had no legitimate claim to the throne at all, but if she would follow her sister's example by accepting the supremacy of the popes he might condescend to allow her to reign! His message was treated as it deserved, but it altered the attitude of the Marian bishops towards Elizabeth. She was crowned on the 13th of January by *Bishop Oglethorpe*, of Carlisle; but the other prelates refused to recognise or attend the ceremony. *Lord Burleigh* was then made Prime Minister, and he recommended that the queen's late tutor, *Dr. Parker*, who had lived in close retirement during Mary's reign, should be chief counsellor in Church affairs. The people proved loyal at the elections, and Elizabeth's first parliament met on the 25th of January. All the bills submitted to it related to ecclesiastical affairs. The first statute passed, after a long and hot debate of two months' duration, revived the ancient jurisdiction of the Crown over all estates in the realm; wisely substituting *Supreme Governor* for the objectionable title supreme 'Head.' This was a very effective reply to Paul IV. The act was a most comprehensive one. It

repealed all the religious acts of Mary's reign, and restored those which were in force at Edward's death. As some of the latter had proved mischievous, saving clauses were inserted in it to correct their unsatisfactory parts; such as the interference with the ancient privilege that cathedral chapters should have 'leave to elect' their bishops. The prelates who owed their preferment to Mary's government strongly opposed the passage of the measure at every stage, as indeed they did all the acts of that session, but it passed into law on April 20th. The episcopal opposition must be looked upon in the light of the recent persecutions. Several of the bishops had accepted the principles of the bills under Henry and Edward; but they had taken an opposite course under Mary, and shed much blood in furtherance of their changed opinions. It was not to be expected that they would now condemn the late martyrdoms by countenancing principles which a few months before they had rigorously prosecuted as the most terrible of human offences. The Succession Act provided for the establishment of a *High Commission Court*, which should examine and decide upon ecclesiastical causes, from whose judgment there should be no appeal. It was not to allow any doctrines to be 'heresy' unless the Scriptures or the decisions of the four Catholic Councils declared them to be so. We shall hear of it again. Naturally the annates and first fruits were again denied to the see of Rome, but Elizabeth followed her father's example by appropriating them to Crown uses, so that the clergy continued to groan under the burden. It was not lightened until the eighteenth century.

2. The Restoration of the Liturgy.—Concurrently with the new Act of Supremacy, Parliament discussed a new Act of Uniformity with reference to public worship. Convocation possesses the sole right of regulating doctrinal and devotional matters; but as it was not advisable for the new government to imitate Mary's counsellors by forcibly "packing" that assembly, and as the contemporary Convocation was known to be opposed to any new revision of the Latin Service-books, it was decided to fall back upon the English Books of Common Prayer which had already received the sanction of a previous Convocation. A commission was appointed to revise them, with Dr. Parker for its president, which included many returned exiles; but it did not favour the queen's desire to restore the ceremonial of the First English Book. The Privy Council felt that moderate measures were needed to ensure the stability of the throne, and that the nation would not consent to forego ancient religious customs merely to please the few who advocated modern Swiss and German practices. Meanwhile a public disputation was held at Westminster, and attended by the members of Parliament, as to the right of National Churches to decree rites and ceremonies in accordance with the Word of God; and as to whether the Scriptures forbade public worship in the vernacular, or justified

the theory that the Eucharist was a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of quick and dead. The disputants were selected from the learned Marian clergy and those which had occupied similar positions under Edward VI.; but the former disregarded the conditions of debate mutually agreed upon beforehand, and so brought the discussion to an abrupt termination. Bishops *White*, of Winchester, and *Watson* of Lincoln, declared that the Queen and Council deserved excommunication for expecting them to argue upon such matters, for which seditious language they were compelled to spend a little season in the Tower of London. The ultimate result of these preliminaries may be best expressed in the words of the statute.

"*Whereas*, at the death of our late Sovereign lord king Edward VI., there remained one uniform order of common service and prayer . . . authorised by "Act of Parliament, holden in the 5th and 6th years of our said late Sovereign lord "king Edward VI., entitled '*An Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer, and "administration of the Sacraments*' the which was repealed and taken away by "Act of Parliament in the first year of our late Sovereign lady queen Mary, to the "great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to professors of the truth of "Christ's religion.

"*Be it therefore enacted*, by the authority of this present Parliament, *that the "said statute of repeal, and everything therein contained concerning the said "book . . . shall be void and of none effect . . . and that the said "book . . . shall stand, and be in full force and effect*, according to the tenor "of this statute, anything in the aforesaid statute of repeal to the contrary notwithstanding.

"*And further be it enacted . . . that all and singular ministers, in any "cathedral or parish church, shall from and after the feast of the Nativity of "John Baptist next coming, be bounden to say and use the Matins, Evensong, "Celebration of the Lord's Supper and administration of each of the Sacraments, "and all their common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned "in the said book, so authorised by Parliament in the said 5th and 6th years of "King Edward VI., with one alteration or addition of certain Lessons to be used "on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the litany altered and corrected, "and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communi- "cants, and none other, or otherwise."*

The alteration mentioned in the Litany was the omission of the suffrage respecting the bishop of Rome (see page 39) and a slight addition to the petition for the monarch's good life. The change in the Communion Office was merely the combination of the old and new sentences (page 71) by which the words of administration assumed their present form. There were two other alterations not mentioned in the act, viz.:—the omission of the rubric as to kneeling at the end of the Communion Office, which a subsequent Convocation restored; and the insertion of the "Ornaments Rubric" just before the daily Matins, retained in all subsequent revisions, which revived vestments and chancel arrangements 'as were in this Church of

England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward.' It was very irregular for the Queen and Parliament to make these emendations without the consent of Convocation, but the end excused the means; and there is cause for thankfulness that no attempt was made to do more than appease the conflicting parties.¹ The use of the *Second Book* of Edward's reign satisfied all but the revolutionary reformers, and the carefully judged additions, omissions, and corrections, conciliated all but the extremest partisans of Rome. On April 28, after a protracted discussion, the Act of Uniformity became law (1 Eliz. c. 2), and although there was no obligation to use the Book before June 24 it immediately came into general use. An objection was subsequently made by Bishop Bonner that the 'Ordinal' was illegal, because not expressly mentioned in the Statute. To remove all doubt a short act was passed later on, explaining that the Ordination Service, having been bound up with the 'Second Book,' was understood to be part of the Book, and therefore legalised by the Statute of Uniformity.

3. **The Vacant Bishoprics.**—Besides the primacy six sees were vacated by death before the accession of Elizabeth:—Oxford (December, 1557), Salisbury (April, 1558), Bangor (May, 1558), Gloucester and Hereford (September, 1558), and Bristol (November, 1558); and two bishops died after the accession, but before the above acts were passed, viz.:—Norwich (December, 1558), and Chichester (January 2, 1559). There were therefore only sixteen bishops in possession of sees out of an episcopate of twenty-five. On May 15, after they had been given time to consider the new statutes, these sixteen prelates were summoned to the queen that they might take the oath of supremacy. With the single exception of the bishop of Llandaff they all refused. The act provided that any refusal of the oath incurred forfeiture of any public position in Church or Realm. The bishops were therefore deprived. But not all at once. There was no harsh treatment, such as was extended to their predecessors by Mary, and they knew well that their lives were secure. The names of the bishops are appended in the footnote,² in the order of their deprivation, from which it is clear that every opportunity was given the least objectionable ones to alter their minds before any attempt was made to fill the sees vacated by their disloyalty.

1 The late Mr. Wayland Joyce, who published a work called "*Acts of the Church*" just before his death, in 1887, claimed to have discovered a document which goes to show that these alterations had first received the sanction of an Episcopal synod, but this requires confirming.

2 The fourteen bishops deprived were as follows:—*Bonner* of London (deprived June 2, 1559), *Scott* of Chester and *Oglethorpe* of Carlisle (June 21), *Morgan* of St. David's and *Baines* of Lichfield (June 24), *Pate* of Worcester (June 30), *Watson* of Lincoln (July 2), *Goldwell* of St. Asaph (July 15), *White* of Winchester (July 18), *Heath*, archbishop of York, and *Tonstall*, bishop of Durham (September 29), *Bourne* of Bath and Wells and *Poole* of Peterboro' (November 11), *Turberville* of Exeter (November 16), and *Thurby* of Ely (November 23). Bishop *Griffith* of Rochester was not deprived. He had long been sick and he died on November 20.

Bishops White and Watson had been sent to the Tower temporarily, as a punishment for their seditious conduct at the Westminster disputation, but they were soon released and allowed to go abroad with pensions; as were Bishops Pate, Scott and Goldwell later on. Bishop Bonner, whose part in the late persecutions had brought him much odium was confined in the Marshalsea prison, chiefly for fear of the mob; but the remainder were consigned to the custody of their friends, or committed to the care and hospitality of the bishops who obtained their places. Three of them, Bishops Poole and Turberville, and Archbishop Heath, were allowed to retire upon their private estates, the last named being often visited by Queen Elizabeth. This lenient treatment of refractory prelates compared favourably with the harsh measures of the preceding reign. Accounts do not agree as to the total number of clergy who refused to accept the Oath of Supremacy and Act of Uniformity; some say 189, others 296—but no list exceeds 400. And there were 9,400 clergy at the time. In other words an overwhelming majority, more than twenty to one, of the clergy accepted the restored supremacy and liturgy with more or less cheerfulness. When we consider further who the



QUEEN ELIZABETH.

few objectors were we find that they had nearly all been appointed by the papal advisers of Queen Mary to benefices in crown patronage because they were well known to be staunch upholders of papal pretensions. Nothing can demonstrate with more clearness than this the continuance of the old Church of the Nation. In spite of the rapid and drastic changes hundreds of clergy of all grades were able to retain their benefices from before the close of Henry's reign to well on into that of Elizabeth. The very rapidity with which one government succeeded another prevented any complete

change in the *personnel* of the Church, even had such a measure been desirable. Every official document of Elizabeth's reign

expressly disclaims any intention of breaking the Church's continuity. But there was a source of great danger to the Church from the defection of the bishops. Many of the returned exiles affected to care nothing for the episcopal office and saw no merit therein, but sober-minded and faithful men knew that "from the apostles' time there had ever been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons"—and that the regular succession of bishops had always been the acknowledged connexion between the apostolic root and national branches of the one holy and universal Church. But the succession, though endangered, was not lost. Among the exiles were several of the bishops who had been forcibly deprived in Mary's reign *without any canonical process*. These had returned to England; and when the still undeprived Marian bishops declined to aid in consecrating successors to the sees which had been vacated by death, they were appointed to perform the requisite episcopal acts; every care being taken that all should be done rightly and canonically, so that none should have occasion of cavil thereafter.

4. Consecration of Archbishop Parker.—The most important business was to consecrate a successor to the primacy in the place of Cardinal Pole, who died soon after Queen Mary. Dr. Parker was nominated by Elizabeth and duly elected by the Dean and Chapter of Christ's Church, Canterbury, by virtue of the customary *congé d'élire*, August 1, 1559. On September 9 a commission was issued to six bishops, three Edwardian and three Marian, for his consecration, but the latter declined to officiate, as they had refused to take part in the coronation, and four more Edwardian bishops were named in their stead (December 6). Of the seven thus nominated, any four of whom were empowered to act, although three would have been sufficient to ensure a valid consecration, the following were in attendance on December 17, the day of consecration:—*William Barlow*, consecrated in Henry's reign, 1536, to be bishop of St. Asaph; *John Scory*, who had been consecrated to Rochester in Edward's reign, 1551, and appointed to Chichester 1552; *Miles Coverdale*, the translator of the Bible, made suffragan bishop in the reign of Henry, and appointed to the see of Exeter in Edward's reign; and *John Hodgkins*, suffragan bishop of Bedford, also of the reign of Edward. These details are given because fictitious rumours were propagated half a century later intended to throw suspicion on the validity of Parker's consecration, which are still revived on occasion by Romanists. No official act was ever more carefully and accurately performed. It is very rare that the details of a ceremony in those days are so minutely recorded as the circumstance of his consecration. It took place in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace December 17, 1559, in the presence of a goodly gathering. The ceremony within the Altar rails, as far as can be

judged from the copious reports, was sketched some years ago by Mr. Dyce, R.A., who bequeathed his unfinished picture to Mr. George



ARCHBISHOP PARKER.

Richmond, R.A., and the latter has kindly allowed it to be reproduced as our frontispiece. The picture is not free from anachronisms, few pictures are that were painted 300 years after the event, but it helps us to realise a most important act. The records state that the east end of Lambeth Palace Chapel was adorned at the time with tapestry, and that the floor was covered with red cloth. Only the actual ceremony is depicted, but there were numerous eye-witnesses besides in the body of the chapel. Dr. Thomas Yale read the royal mandate for

the consecration, and the service proceeded according to the English Ordinal. Bishop Barlow, as the senior consecrator, is seated; and we learn from the records that he was arrayed in a silk cope, as were Archdeacons Bullingham and Guest, who stand before and to the right of the Altar in the picture. Dr. Parker is represented kneeling; those standing behind the chair being Bishop Coverdale on the extreme left, clad in a black woollen gown, Bishop Scory in surplice and hood, and Bishop Hodgkins in surplice and chimere. All the bishops laid hands upon the new archbishop, and repeated the essential words in the act of consecration; and as there can be no doubt of the validity of Parker's consecration, so there can be none as to the succession of episcopal Orders in our Church; for Archbishop Parker and his consecrators proceeded to fill up the other vacancies as soon as suitable men were found for the positions. There was a dearth of clergy at that time, owing to there having been so few bishops and to the practical suspension of episcopal functions for over a year; but the newly consecrated bishops endeavoured to make up for lost time, by ordaining clergy and confirming the churches everywhere, so that before very long the Church of England found itself again in working order. A few people have questioned the validity of Archbishop Parker's consecration because the bishops who officiated were not in possession of sees. But the expulsion of those men from their benefices by Queen Mary's commission could not take away their spiritual functions, any more than the deprivation of Bishop Ken and others at the Revolution did. Though their acts may be considered irregular, they were certainly not invalid. Our colonial bishops *e.g.* often resign their sees and return to England. They are frequently employed in assisting the home bishops in confirmations, ordinations, and consecrations. So it has always been and is still with every episcopal Church. All that is needful for us to know is that those who did episcopal acts were themselves

properly appointed and consecrated. It is not always possible, after the lapse of centuries, to trace the parchments of every bishop's consecration; and because Bishop Barlow's own consecration is not recorded in the Lambeth register his official acts have been declared invalid by a few modern papalists. But nothing can be proved or disproved by that omission, because the records of many other bishops, such as Gardiner, whose orders have never been doubted, are missing in like manner. There are, however, abundant evidences elsewhere that Barlow was properly admitted to the episcopate, and that he was acknowledged by his colleagues on the episcopal bench during the last ten years of Henry's reign as a properly consecrated bishop. The best proof of Parker's consecration after all, is that none of the Marian bishops, who would have delighted to throw discredit on the chief opponent of their systems if possible, ever showed any public dissent or protest respecting the validity of the transaction.¹ Fifty years elapsed after the event took place before anyone suggested a doubt about Parker's consecration; and eighty years passed by before Barlow's was questioned. The next business was to fill up the other vacant bishoprics. On the 20th of December, Bishops Barlow and Scory were confirmed in their appointments to the sees of Chichester and Hereford, vacant by death. The next day four new bishops were consecrated for London, Ely, Worcester and Bangor; a month later four others for St. David's, Lincoln, Salisbury and St. Asaph; and on March 24th, 1560, three more for Rochester, Bath and Wells, and Lichfield and Coventry. The other sees were kept vacant for a time, owing to the dearth of suitable men, but by 1562 every vacancy was supplied with a bishop; and since that time there has not been any real danger of losing the succession. Archbishop Parker proved himself an able administrator such as the Church needed in those days; for he kept a firm hand over a disorganised clergy, compelling them to dress becomingly and conduct the services with reverence and regularity. In this he was helped by the re-issue of the *Injunctions* of Edward's reign, revised and improved from experience of past years. He had sometimes to contend with difficulties arising out of the queen's character, and still oftener with the bishops who were anxious for drastic reforms; but before he died in 1575 his wise policy towards Romanists, his restriction of Puritan innovations, his resolution to purify ritual, and his zealous personal labours, had effected a lasting and solid settlement of the Reformed English Church.

1 The following words of the learned German theologian, Dr. von Döllinger, from his speech at the Reunion Conference at Bonn, in 1875, ought to be conclusive: "The fact that Parker was consecrated by four rightly consecrated Bishops, *rite et legitime*, with imposition of hands and the necessary words, is so well attested that, if one chooses to doubt this fact, one could, with the same right, doubt one hundred thousand facts. . . . The fact is as well established as a fact can be required to be. Bossuet has acknowledged the validity of Parker's consecration, and no critical historian can dispute it. The Orders of the Romish Church could be disputed with more appearance of reason."

5. **The Articles of Religion.**—After the Lutheran reformers came to England in 1538 (see page 36) an attempt was made to explain the reforming opinions by a document known as the *Thirteen Articles*, founded upon the Confession of Augsburg. There had long been a general tendency among religious communities to set out their ideas in a formal explanatory code; and the Council of Trent, which had been holding session after session since 1545, drew up a similar statement of Romanist belief. The “Thirteen Articles” were never authorised, but in 1551 Archbishop Cranmer was directed “to frame a Book of Articles of Religion for the preserving and maintaining peace and unity of doctrine.” When finished they were forty-two in number. Having been submitted to and accepted by Convocation they received royal authority (May 1553) and were very generally subscribed by the clergy; but the accession of Mary within two months of their publication caused them to be suppressed. As soon as the Elizabethan episcopal difficulties were set at rest, the attention of Convocation was directed to the revival of the Articles; but the dangerous tenets of those who returned from exile ‘with Germanical natures’ as Archbishop Parker was wont to describe them, ‘who under cover of Reformation sought the ruin and subversion both of learning and of religion,’ rendered a very careful revision necessary. This was done, and in 1563 they appeared as *Thirty-eight Articles*. They were again revised in 1571, when they assumed their present order and number. On the application of Convocation these Thirty-nine Articles were sanctioned by Parliament and ratified by Queen Elizabeth. They have ever since been the test of orthodox Churchmanship; and until recently subscription to them was needed from all who held official positions under Government. Kindred formularies—like the Confessions of Augsburg and Wittenberg, and the Creed issued by the Council of Trent—are considered by Lutherans and Romanists as essential *articles of faith*; belief in which is considered necessary for every Christian’s salvation. But the Thirty-nine Articles now printed at the end of our Prayer-book are in no sense to be considered as an authoritative creed for all Churchmen. They are rather limitations, explanations, and safeguards—against Romanism on the one hand and extreme Puritanism on the other—subscription to which gives assurance of the subscriber’s loyalty. The Three Creeds mentioned in our present eighth article, which derive their doctrinal authority wholly from God’s Word, are the only formulæ besides the Scriptures that are binding upon all English Churchmen. The Thirty-nine Articles were originally printed in English and Latin, in order that their meaning might be interpreted more easily. As they took the shape of a formal public document it is clear that they should be accepted in their literal and grammatical sense alone; which can be ascertained by references to contemporary literature and other formularies of the time. As they do not pretend to be complete or exhaustive, there is no reason why

all Churchmen should not sign them in good faith; and as they were intended to be pacificatory we ought not to strain their meaning. In 1563 many Puritan clergy resigned their benefices, rather than subscribe the Articles of Religion, but we shall hear of them presently. Article XXXV. mentions two books of *Homilies*. The first book has already been referred to. The second book appeared in 1563 and was compiled by Bishop Jewell; the same who published the famous *Apology for the Church of England* in 1561, which for several successive reigns was placed by royal command in every church of the land for the instruction of the people. The 'Apology' and 'Homilies' were both 'very necessary for those times,' but both have long been obsolete. Two revisions of the English Bible were made about this time. One is known as the *Geneva Bible*. It was translated abroad by William Whittingham, and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. It had a large circulation, but there were so many errors in it that the primate caused a new translation to be made. This was published with authority in 1568 and known as *Parker's Bible*. Ultimately it was ordered that no other version should be read in churches.

6. The Council of Trent.¹—When Henry VIII. had given the death blow to papal power in England, and had been excommunicated by Paul III., he appealed to a General Council against the ban. The Pope then summoned a Council at *Mantua*, and cited Henry to appear before it; but the latter declined on the ground that it was not properly convoked.² The condition of the Romish Church was then so bad in head and members that all pious people demanded a general reform, and men like Luther, before they drifted too far from Catholicism, had professed willingness to abide by the decisions of a completely representative Council. The Church of Rome was bound to meet this general demand; but while outwardly consenting, care was taken so to arrange representation and formulate business that whatever happened her own errors should not be condemned. Various places were suggested for the Council to meet at, but the princes refused their assent. At last the city of Trent in the Austrian Tyrol was decided on, and invitations were sent out. The Church of England did not recognise the Council, and therefore did not send representatives; but the outlawed English ecclesiastic, Cardinal Pole was nominated by the pope to represent this country, so as to preserve the semblance of universality. A formal preliminary session took place on December 13th, 1545, but there were very few deputies present. There were twenty-five meetings altogether, spread over a period of eighteen years, so that the members present were never the same; those who did attend being

¹ See Dr. Littledale's *Short History of Council of Trent*, S.P.C.K., 1s.

² See Articles of Religion XXI.

mostly Italians. Ten years intervened between the 16th and 17th sessions, 1552-1562; so that there were no meetings during the reign of Queen Mary. Pius IV. wanted Elizabeth to send representatives to the seventeenth session in 1562, but she refused to let the papal nuncio communicate with the prelates; because the Council was 'not free, pious, or Christian,' and because the terms of invitation were humiliating. Other European princes declined for similar reasons. It was therefore in no sense a 'General' Council, and consequently its decrees have no binding force on Christians who repudiate the papal claims to world-wide domination. The last meeting took place Dec. 3, 1563, and the doctrinal decisions arrived at were embodied in the famous Creed of Pope Pius IV., which contains many articles of faith not found in any former profession of Christian



THE CITY OF TRENT (AUSTRIAN TYROL).

belief. Romanists have since been bound to accept Papal 'Traditions' as of equal authority with Holy Scripture, and to receive as *de fide* the following unauthorised dogmas: the Trent decrees on Justification and Original Sin; a propitiatory sacrifice for living and dead in the Eucharist; Transubstantiation and Communion in one kind; Purgatory; Invocation of Saints and veneration of their images or relics; Indulgences; the Church of Rome as the mother and mistress of all Churches, and obedience to the pope as vicar of Christ; and all other decrees of the 'holy Council of Trent.' Many of the above doctrines had been floating about for generations as pious opinions, not positively binding, but the above-mentioned Creed 'hardened into positive law much that was previously open and indeterminate, thereby laying a heavy burden on the modern Roman Catholic's conscience from which his forefathers were free'

(*Littledale*). They have to profess it as "the true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved." The articles of the Church of England were long anterior to this presumptuous document.

7. The First English Roman Catholics.—We have referred (page 86) to the dissentients who declined to accept the English Prayer-book because of their papal predilections. Some of these were suspected of conspiring to set the Queen of Scotland and France on the English throne and restore the Romish hierarchy, to prevent which Elizabeth sent open and secret aid to the Scottish reformers, who were endeavouring to keep their queen in France. Severe statutes against the Romanists were passed in 1562, but there was very little need at first to enforce them. A strong government that is responsive to the instinct of self-preservation can generally command obedience through fear, if not by love, and although the Romanisers did not care for the Act of Uniformity, they continued to worship in the churches as formerly. Foreign princes interested themselves on their behalf, and asked that the deprived bishops might have churches handed over to them in which they could use the Latin service books. Queen Elizabeth replied, that "to grant them separate churches, and permit them to keep up a distinct communion, were things which neither the public interest nor her own honour would allow. . . . For there was no new faith propagated in England; no religion set up but that which was commanded by our Saviour, preached by the Primitive Church, and unanimously approved by the ancient Fathers." A very significant statement was afterwards made from the judicial bench by Lord Chief Justice Coke that Pope Pius IV. had sent a private nuncio to England in 1560, with an offer to agree to all the changes the English Church had made in the Liturgy, the translation of the Scriptures, and the appointment of bishops, *if only his supremacy might be recognized*. The nuncio was forbidden to land, but the circumstance proves that the chief struggle between England and Rome was for the right of a National Church to be free from alien jurisdiction; and that no new faith was imposed on the nation. Our Church's further claim that each National Church has the right of adapting its services to the varying needs of race, and clime, and speech (so that nothing be done contrary to the Word of God and the customs of the primitive Church) had been allowed over and over again. In 1570, after the futile rebellion in the North of England (see page 98), when Pope Pius V. saw that all hope of recovering England by diplomacy had failed, he published a Bull of excommunication (*Regnans in excelsis*) against Elizabeth; in which she was most insultingly described, her subjects absolved from their allegiance, the throne declared vacant, and all Christians loyal to the pope commanded to separate themselves from the mode of worship she upheld in her realm! A very few persons obeyed this mandate, and became the *first English Roman*

Catholics, but the vast majority of English Churchfolk who had cherished a lingering love for the papacy were so horrified at this exhibition of ultramontane insolence against a monarch who was daily rising in popular esteem, that they at once became firmly loyal to the national religion. The English Church is not a schism from the Church of Rome, but the English Roman Catholics seceded from the old Church of England. The intrepid man who nailed a copy of the above bull on the bishop of London's door was executed as a traitor forthwith, and the laws against Romanists were made increasingly severe. Public opinion was still further outraged when the news arrived of the massacre of over 20,000 Huguenots in France, at the instigation of Catharine de Medici, on St. Bartholomew's Eve 1572. This fearful deed of blood was much belauded by the pope, who ordered medals to be struck in commemoration; but it increased the bitterness with which Englishmen regarded everything papal, and gave the impending political struggles of our country against France and Spain the character of religious crusades. Cardinal Allen's 'counter reformation' began about the same time. He set up English colleges at Douay and Rome where young men were trained with full purpose of being sent to 'convert England to papal obedience.' The first mission was led by the Jesuit fathers *Parsons* and *Campion*. They knew the laws were very severe against them, but they accepted the risk and bravely bore the penalty when captured. They advocated conspiracy and treason in order to compass their ends, and were treated with very little mercy. *Campion* was soon caught, and put to cruel torture to make him inform against his fellow-conspirators, but he maintained a resolute silence and was put to death. The people who suffered death in Mary's reign for professing a faith opposed to that ordered by the government were avowedly burnt because their faith was held to be heretical; but Romanists who were executed in the time of Queen Elizabeth though they also suffered for their religious beliefs, were ostensibly punished as political offenders and traitors to the throne.

8. The First Puritan¹ Nonconformists.—The English Church had other adversaries, more numerous and successful than the Romanists, in the extreme Puritans, who advocated the religious systems of Calvin, Luther, &c. They gave much trouble to Archbishop Parker, but far more to his successors. They had many friends in high places, and were well represented in Parliament, from which Romanists were excluded because they refused to take the oath of the queen's supremacy; and they were continually reinforced by foreign refugees. Thus in 1567 the Duke of Alva's persecution in the Netherlands drove many Dutchmen to England, who were allowed to establish themselves in eight English towns and

¹ So called because they professed to desire a simpler (purer) form of worship.

worship according to their convictions. The well-known church of the Austin Friars, near the Bank of England, was appropriated to the use of those who settled in London, and the Dutch Reformed Church have held it ever since. So too, after the massacre of St. Bartholomew, many Huguenot families took refuge in England; besides which, and of far greater importance, correspondence was continued between the English clergy who had returned from exile and those with whom they had associated when abroad. When the English Prayer-book was enforced by the Act of Uniformity, and the clergy compelled to subscribe the XXXIX Articles (1563), many Puritans resigned their cures, but many more remained to stir up strife within the Church, and several bishops gave them every latitude. Just as Bishop Hooper had refused to be consecrated in the episcopal habit, and Bishop Coverdale would only attend the consecration of Parker in a gown of sombre black, so many clergy objected to the inoffensive surplice, and to all adornment of the churches. There were others who objected to the ancient system of government and discipline in the Church, preferring the method authorised by John Calvin; others again who wished to be perfectly 'independent' with services and ministers to suit each congregation, so long as



AUSTIN FRIARS' CHURCH.


neither were suspected of Romanism or Episcopacy. The latter were led by *Robert Brown*, domestic chaplain to the Duke of Norfolk, and master of a Free School in London. He disobeyed the injunctions and was summoned before the High Commission Court, but at the intercession of his patron was allowed to go to Norwich and minister to a large population of Calvinists who had come from Holland. He attracted other discontented persons and formed the *first Dissenting community* (1568). His language became so violent and seditious that he was obliged to fly to the Continent for safety. Ultimately (1581) he returned and confessed his errors, and was collated to the rectory of *Thorpe-Achurch* in Northamptonshire. But his novel system continued

to spread, and is now known as *Congregationalism*. The opponents of Episcopacy grew more numerous as the papacy grew more insistent. The Puritans refused to dissociate the time-honoured and Apostolic method of Church government from the papal interpretation of it. All 'prelacy' was hateful to them, because they wished to be untrammelled and undisciplined. At the close of the year 1570 *Thomas Cartwright*, a returned exile, then Lady Margaret professor of divinity at Cambridge, openly lectured against Episcopacy, the Prayer-book and 'habits' [vestments]. He was expelled the University and migrated to Antwerp. In 1571, after passing the statutes (13 Eliz., c. 1 and 2) against Romanists and papal bulls, the Puritans in Parliament agitated for a more thorough reformation, and the next year a Mr. Wentworth actually introduced two bills proposing alterations in the national religion on the Genevan model, which the house proceeded to discuss; but Elizabeth sent a very peremptory message down to say that no bills on Church matters should be dealt with unless previously approved by Convocation.¹ Then Cartwright issued pamphlets from Antwerp, called '*Admonitions to Parliament*,' in which the Church was violently attacked. These were widely circulated, and resulted in the formation of the *first Presbyterian Congregation* in England (1572). The queen rebuked the bishops for their want of discipline, and when Bishop Jewell proved that the most violent puritanical preachers, *Heath, Batton, Coleman*, and *Hallingham* were Jesuits in disguise, whose object was to destroy the Catholic character of the old National Church, the revolutionary tide began to ebb. Archbishop Parker died in 1575, and Bishop Grindall was translated from York to succeed him. He had been an exile in Queen Mary's reign, and was somewhat in sympathy with the Puritans. He thought the disorders were owing to the scarcity of good preachers; so he encouraged the religious exercises called '*Prophesyings*,'² although he knew they had been forbidden by the queen and by his predecessor as dangerous to discipline, because they were often used for the publication of heterodox ideas. The queen exercised her supremacy by ordering their suppression. The new primate refused to comply and was forthwith suspended by the *Star Chamber Court*; which took cognizance of offences against

1 "Upon serious consideration," says a well-known Church historian of an earlier age than ours, "it will appear that there was nothing done in the reformation of religion save what was asked for by the clergy in their Convocation, or grounded on some act of theirs precedent to it, with the advice, counsel and consent of the bishops and most eminent Churchmen, confirmed upon the past fact, and not otherwise by the civil sanction, according to the usage of the best and happiest times of Christianity" (*Fuller*), and this is confirmed by a more recent writer who says that all through the reforming epoch "Acts of Parliament did not precede, but followed in point of time the decisions of the spirituality, and were merely auxiliary to the Acts of Convocation" (*Wayland Joyce*).

2 Religious debates, in which clergy and laity showed off their oratorical gifts.

the royal prerogative. His see remained sequestered till his death in 1583, but he was allowed to perform the essentially archiepiscopal functions. His successor was *John Whitgift*, who had been Cartwright's great opponent. He proved a strict disciplinarian. Many people consider that he was much too strict. It was then (1583) that the *Court of High Commission* was established on a permanent foundation to adjudicate on all offences against the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. It consisted of forty-four commissioners, twelve of whom were bishops, twelve lay privy councillors, and the remainder clergy and laymen in equal proportions. The refractory



THE TEMPLE CHURCH, LONDON, E.C.

Puritans were quickly brought to order by its means, although not without many libellous attacks upon the bishops on their part; and chiefly in the notorious *Martin Mar-prelate Tracts*, which abused and slandered everything connected with the Church's doctrine and discipline in the most vicious and abominable language. The printing-press was thus made a terrible engine of sedition and blasphemy. But good came out of evil—for men were moved to use tongue and pen in defence of the Church with far more power than the High Commission Court could wield. The Mastership of

the Temple church happened to be vacant in 1584, and Lord Burleigh wished Cartwright's friend and seconder, *Walter Travers*, who was already Reader there, to receive the appointment; but it was conferred on a remarkably able man whom the Archbishop of York recommended, viz., *Richard Hooker*. A lengthened controversy then went on through the press between the Master and the Reader which resulted in the production of the most famous defence of the Church of England ever written—*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594). No book ever did so much to prove the Catholic character of the English Church, nor demonstrate more clearly that the best interests of the nation were bound up in its welfare. To set the Puritan controversy at rest Archbishop Whitgift was induced to sanction a Calvinistic formulary known as the *Lambeth Articles* (1595), but Convocation did not approve them, nor would Elizabeth give her sanction to their enforcement. They never had any authority in the Church, but their frigid terms testify to a desire for abstruse definitions which make religion intolerant.

9. *Mary Queen of Scots*.—In 1561 Mary Stuart became a widow, and returned from France to Scotland. She found *John Knox* in the plenitude of his power, and her ancestral religion overthrown (see page 107). After fruitless attempts to govern a distracted kingdom for seven years she was forced to resign her crown and take refuge in England (1568), where she was detained as a prisoner of State. Everyone knew that she was heir presumptive to the English throne, and it was equally well known that she favoured the Romanist party. The earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland raised a rebellion in her behalf with the avowed object of dethroning Elizabeth, which was joined by many leading papalists. The rising was speedily suppressed and the promoters executed. This gave rise to new anti-papal statutes, especially the *Test Act* (13 Eliz., c. 12) by which all civil officers were compelled to subscribe the XXXIX Articles. Henceforward Mary's presence in England was a source of danger to the state, and when Cardinal Allen's seminarists spread abroad their seditious teaching the Puritan majority in Parliament clamoured for her death. Several conspiracies were discovered against Elizabeth's life with which she was said to be connected; and in 1586, after 18 years captivity, she was charged with complicity in such a plot. A number of young Romanist gentlemen under *Anthony Babington* had conspired to kill the English queen and it was proved that Mary had corresponded with them. She denied that her intention had been more than to regain freedom, but the commissioners who tried her convicted her of treason, and she was beheaded at Fotheringay Castle February 8, 1587. Her sad end is a great blot on the fame of Queen Elizabeth. She bequeathed her prospective rights in the English Throne to Philip II. of Spain, the husband of the late Queen Mary of England, setting aside her own son James VI. of

Scotland, because he was a 'Protestant.' There had been secret hostility between England and Spain for some time, each helping the other's foes, ever since Elizabeth refused Philip's offer of marriage—but now there was to be open war. Philip was the accepted champion of the Romanists throughout Europe, and Elizabeth was looked upon no less as the hope of all Reformers. Pope Sixtus V. gave his sanction to Philip's enterprise, and great preparations were made for the invasion of England and the restoration of papal supremacy. The threatened danger made men forget their religious differences, and Romanist Englishmen freely joined with Puritan Englishmen, side by side with the English Churchmen, in offering aid to the nation in its day of trouble by placing their ships, and money, and persons at its disposal.



MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTS.

10. The Spanish Armada.—There is no more inspiring chapter in our national annals than the story of the Spanish overthrow. The love of the sea and its perils had never been absent from the descendants of the old Sea-kings who made the British Isles their home; and the names of Drake, Frobisher, Hawkins, Raleigh, with a host besides, will never be lost sight of in the history of maritime adventures; but they will be remembered best for the part they played in helping to defeat the Spaniards. In 1588 The English Navy was small and badly equipped, and the threatened invasion by Philip was delayed so long that the volunteer vessels were actually paid off and ordered home, in the belief that he would not prosecute the crusade. But on the 19th of July a Scotch privateer ran into Plymouth Bay to tell the English Admiral, *Lord Howard*, that the Spanish fleet had been seen off the coast of Cornwall. Immediately the country and sea-board were alive with defenders. The English officers were playing bowls when this news arrived, but

were not at all disconcerted. Drake's reply to the messenger "There will be time to finish our game and beat the Spaniards too" is typical of the cool courage of our sailor warriors then. There was no panic, but all were filled with a loyal enthusiasm for the maintenance of home and faith and freedom. Warning beacons blazed on every hill as the appointed signals for rallying to the struggle.

"Far on the deep the Spaniards saw, along each southern shire
Cape beyond cape in endless range those twinkling points of fire."

And by the time the foe appeared in sight Lord Howard had his little fleet in trim. 'Disposed in the form of a crescent, the horns of




ENGLISH AND SPANISH SHIPS, *temp.* ARMADA.

which were seven miles asunder, those gilded, towered, floating castles, with their goodly standards and their martial music, moved slowly along the channel with an air of indolent pomp.' They were followed by the English ships, which kept up a running sea fight on any Spanish vessels that dropped astern; and this went on for days until the Armada anchored in the Calais roads on the 27th of July. It was commanded by the *Duke of Medina Sidonia*, who hoped soon to be joined by another imposing navy under the *Duke of Parma*. But the latter was blockaded by the Dutch in Flanders. They thought themselves '*Invincible*,' and did not look for much resistance. Some of the ships carried a supply of Romish priests, who were to be placed

In charge of English parishes, and implements of the Spanish Inquisition for the torture of 'heretics.' At midnight on July 28th, the English silently towed eight small vessels covered with tar and filled with inflammable materials towards the Armada, and having ignited them let them drift into the midst of the hundred and fifty gorgeous galleons. In terror the Spaniards cut their cables and put to sea in the greatest disorder. At daybreak the separated ships of the now disunited host were attacked by the active and well managed English vessels and forced to fly. Had the English ships been better supplied with provisions and ammunition the historian might have had a different tale to tell. The foe was chased and worried as long as our stores lasted, and then the English boats were compelled to put in port for more. They had hardly done so when a storm arose which drove the Spaniards northwards. In the days before steamships were invented every sea voyage depended on the elements, and they now fought against Spain. The scattered fleet was driven among the Orkneys and Hebrides, while many vessels were dashed to pieces on the rocky coasts of Argyllshire, Antrim, Mayo, and Kerry; only 54 dismantled hulks returning to Spain. Of course there were great rejoicings in England for this memorable deliverance, but it was felt (and who can doubt it) that God's hand was working in and through all for the salvation of our Church and Realm. A commemorative medal was struck, bearing on its face the imagery of a storm-tossed fleet, and on the reverse side "*AFFLAVIT DEUS, ET DISSIPANTUR!*" It was the crowning mercy which finally freed our land from the odious foreign prelate; for since that time the popes have made no attempt to subvert the national religion by violence. It was but natural that Parliament should increase the severity of its statutes against Romanists, lest there should be any lingering hope of better success at a future time; so we read of penal laws being passed in 1593, banishing some and restricting the movements of others, besides the deaths of many on charges of treason. Some Puritans also were executed for seditious writings, and all persons were compelled to attend the parish church once a month. Ultimately the land became peaceful and prosperous. The end of the 16th century was marked by a reaction against Puritanism. "As one by one the generation which had sustained the queen at her accession dropped into the grave, a generation arose which, excepting in books of controversy, knew nothing of any religion which differed from that of the Church of England. The ceremonies and vestments which in the time of their fathers had been exposed to such bitter attacks were to them hallowed, as having been entwined with their earliest associations. It required a strong effort of the imagination to connect them with the forms of a departed system which they had never witnessed with their eyes; but they remembered that those ceremonies had been used, and those vestments had been worn by the clergy, who had led their prayers

during those anxious days, when the Armada, yet unconquered, was hovering round the coast, and who had in their name and in the name of all true Englishmen, offered the thanksgiving which had ascended to heaven after the great victory had been won." And just before the century closed Hooker could say with perfect sincerity—"There is not any man of the Church of England but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth; nor any man a member of the commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England."



11. National Glory.—The Elizabethan period was a brilliant one for English literature—Francis Bacon laid the foundation for modern philosophy, and Richard Hooker invested English prose with an eloquence and dignity it had never previously worn. *Edmund Spenser's Faerie Queene* has delighted all succeeding generations, and the affection for the memory of *William Shakespeare*, whose tomb within the chancel of Stratford-on-Avon church is visited by travellers from the ends of the earth, grows stronger and deeper every day. English ships then ploughed the seas in every direction. Men sailed around the world in voyages measured by years, and brought home specimens of its hidden treasures. The Coast of Guinea was discovered by Sir John Hawkins, and Sir Walter Raleigh


STRATFORD-ON-AVON CHURCH.

founded a colony in America from which sprung the State of Virginia, so named by him in honour of his patroness the 'Virgin Queen' of England. Frobisher and Davis explored the Arctic Ocean, and a regular system of trading was established with the East Indies. The Charter of privileges which Elizabeth granted to the Indian traders in 1600 was the commencement of the famed East India Company which for so long ruled a large part of what is now our Indian Empire. A settled faith, a world-wide commerce, young and thriving plantations abroad, and a high-class literature—all of which contained in themselves the elements of permanence—these were blessings to be thankful for and proud of; fit to be remembered, though with a sense of responsibility, when we wish to turn aside from the unchristian feuds which disgraced the Tudor times. Of the *Church Architecture* at this period not much can be said. Speaking generally it was a development of the 'Perpendicular' style introduced by William of Wykeham at the close of the 14th century, and made more and more florid by the introduction of excessive ornamentation, until its purity and grace was obscured. King's College Chapel, Cambridge (page 15), is an example of it when at its best; the chapel of Henry VII. at the east end of Westminster Abbey being the latest but least worthy specimen. After that the style became 'debased,' the designs inferior, and the workmanship exceedingly bad; as is abundantly clear from the alterations which were made in many parish churches.

12. Summary of Part IV.—The chief object of the foregoing pages has been to show the continuity of Church organisation during the period when the Tudors reigned, and to point out that the statutes by which any changes were brought about expressly disclaim all intention of breaking that continuity. Excepting the celibate communities which lived by rule, and which were appendages rather than integral parts of the Church's system, not a single corporation was dissolved. The Church's corporate life remained unbroken, and all things essential to its existence remained unchanged. The ordinaries retained their jurisdiction, and administered the same law as before. The bishops still sat in the House of Lords and by the same title as before. The Convocations continued to sit concurrently with every Parliament, as before. No historic fact is clearer than that the Church of England retained every essential element of her ancient organisation, her apostolic doctrines, and her national character, all through the years when the Tudors reigned. *She never lost her identity.* She lost her old monasteries, it is true, and cast off many errors that the foreign clergy had introduced; but the bishops and parochial clergy retained their respective positions, performed their duties in the same churches to the same congregations, and retained such endowments as the monastic system had allowed them to keep. Corruptions were cut away, sometimes at the expense

and loss of much that was good; the usurped power of the Popes was successfully overthrown; *but no new Church was founded.* None of the Tudor princes ever thought of such a thing, nor was anything done by them with the assistance of Parliament, that in any way affected the National Church, unless the Church herself had previously assented to the changes in her representative Convocations.

GENEALOGICAL TABLE.



PART V.

The Church of England under the Stuarts.

CHAPTER XXI. (A.D. 1603—1625).

THE GROWTH OF PURITANISM.

"In doctrine and communion they have sought
Firmly between the two extremities to steer;
But theirs the wise man's ordinary lot,
They prophesy to ears that will not hear."—*Wordsworth*.

1.—The Seventeenth Century.¹—The epoch with which this division deals is characterised throughout by a struggle for Constitutional Government in Church and Realm against the despotic power of the Crown. Theoretically the laity had their representatives in Parliament during the reigns of the Tudors, and, also in theory, the clergy had their representatives in Convocation; but both clergy and laity had their constitutional liberty restricted by the personal authority of the monarch. And just as the independent spirit of the Puritan ministers was restrained by the Royal Injunctions and the Court of High Commission, so the murmurings of the Commons were suppressed by the Star Chamber Courts. By the close of Elizabeth's reign the monarchy was almost absolute, and when James VI. of Scotland succeeded her as James I. of England, in 1603, he found it advantageous to cling to the most extreme view of royal supremacy by propagating the new doctrine of 'passive obedience' from both clergy and laity to the *Divine Right* of hereditary rulers. During the whole of the 17th century these pretensions of the Crown "were subjected to a process of continual challenge, in ecclesiastical as in all other affairs. Parliament was gradually establishing its present position; and the bishops and clergy were being taught to relinquish one set of relations for

¹ The writer is indebted for many thoughts in this portion of the book (besides the usual earlier authorities), to Mr. Wakeman's summary of *the Church of the Puritans* (Longmans 2s. 6d.), to Professor Burrows' *Parliament and the Church of England* (Seeley 2s. 6d.), to Mr. Gardiner's *Puritan Revolution* (Longmans 2s. 6d.), to Canon Overton's *Life in the English Church 1660—1714* (Longmans 12s. 6d.), to Dr. Stoughton's *Church of the Revolution* (Hodder and Stoughton 1 s.), and to Mr. Hale's *Fall of the Stuarts* (Longmans 2s. 6d.).

another, to exchange their immediate connection with the Crown for a mutual action and reaction between themselves and Parliament. From the reign of James the First to that of Anne we trace the gradual decay of the Tudor system of Sovereignty, the gradual return in political matters to the principles of the old English Constitution, and in ecclesiastical matters, the gradual growth both of the assertion of lay rights, and the acknowledgment of a limit to the exercise of those rights. At the end of the period all further changes in the relations between Parliament and the Church are by general consent suspended" (*Burrows*). But all through the century the Anglican Church as reformed under the Tudors kept before it a noble purpose distinct from its relationship to the Realm, wherein we may trace the principle of her undying life. "The secret of the strength of the Church of England since the Reformation lay, not where Cranmer sought for it, in the power of the Church to influence and moderate the Protestantism of the Continent, with which it was politically allied; not where Elizabeth and James I. tried to place it, in the support that the Church gave to and derived from the power of the Crown; but where Hooker, and Laud, and George Herbert found it. It lay in the right of the Church to the prestige and the traditions of the Church of the Apostles and of the Middle Ages, in her fearless appeal to history, in the fact that, however great might be for the time her helplessness in the hands of the Crown, however severe the buffetings of discordant opinion she had to endure, though she might change her model of worship, and in part remodel her constitution, nevertheless she preserved unimpaired the faith and the discipline of the Catholic Church" (*Wakeman*). The accession of James I. brought England and Scotland into closer union, for although each country continued to make its own laws and have a separate Parliament, the same king ruled over both. But religion in Scotland had undergone a much greater change than in England; and as Church Government became the chief subject of 17th century troubles, it is necessary to glance at the Scottish Reformation.

2. Scotch Presbyterianism.¹—From the days of St. Columba² up to the twelfth century, the old Celtic Church of Scotland preserved its independence; but it had to bow before the onward march of papal usurpation just as the Church of England had done. Their wild nature and their tribal feuds made the Scots a ready prey to the diplomacy of papal embassies when the sister kingdom sought for aid against Norman conquerors, and the Scots allowed the pope to claim feudal lordship over them that he might help them to keep the English south of the border.³ The ecclesiastical supremacy obtained by Anselm over the Scottish Church⁴ was only temporary; for Pope Clement III.

See Mr. Lloyd's *Sketches of Church History in Scotland*. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d
Vol. I., p. 37. 3 See Vol. I., p. 266. 4 Vol. I., p. 175.

was induced (A.D. 1190) to declare the Scotch Church independent of any authority outside his own. After that the Scotch clergy fell into the worldly-minded habits of mediæval Christianity, and many scandalous proceedings are recorded; as when an illegitimate son of the Scotch king James IV., a child of sixteen years, was created archbishop and primate over the Scottish bishops with the sanction of Pope Julius II.; until the cry went up in Scotland as elsewhere that the Church should be purified. But the Scottish reformation came like a deluge, sweeping away the good and the bad together, until nothing was left of the Apostolic constitution which had descended from the old Celtic Christianity. John Knox, to whom we have already referred as an exile in Geneva, was the leader of the Scotch reformers; and the example of England, with which his position of chaplain to Edward VI. had made him familiar, was speedily followed in the destruction of the Scottish monasteries. During the primacies of Archbishop Beatoun and his successor in the see of St. Andrews, Cardinal Beatoun, several reformers were burnt for heresy, notably *Patrick Hamilton* and *George Wishart*. The latter was an exemplary and learned man, much beloved by

many to whom he had preached, and he was terribly avenged. Sixteen zealots led by *Norman Leslie* stormed the castle of the cardinal who condemned the reformer, and killed him. They flung his body upon the battlements of the castle at the place whence he had watched the burning of Wishart. Leslie, however, had a private feud with Beatoun, which some consider the true cause of the assassination. This was in 1546. The Papalists redoubled their efforts to repress religious reformers, but that only served to spread their doctrines. John Knox returned to Scotland finally in the year 1559, at a time when the reformers were about to defend their headquarters in Perth by force of arms. He preached a sermon to them against image worship with such effect that the excited multitude immediately



JOHN KNOX.

destroyed the ornaments, statuary, and stained glass in every

church of the city, which they followed up by demolishing the stately Carthusian monastery there. "The examples of the reformers in Perth was followed in St. Andrew's and other places; and we have to regret that many beautiful buildings fell a sacrifice to the fury of the lower orders, and were either totally destroyed or reduced to piles of shapeless ruins." (*Scott*). Civil war resulted (1560); English troops sent by Elizabeth being allied with the reformers against French soldiers who upheld the papal party. Henceforward and for twelve years John Knox became despotic ruler of Scotland. His preaching induced the Scotch to return an overwhelming majority of reformers to the Scottish Parliament; and they at once proceeded to give statutory effect to his teaching by abolishing not only the papal usurpation, but everything belonging to the ancient Catholic and Apostolic Christianity, in favour of everything belonging to the Calvinistic doctrines and method of Church government. Episcopacy was done away, and all the old parochial and cathedral churches converted to Presbyterian uses; although quite unfitted in their construction and design for such use. With so little reverence were these sacred edifices regarded that they were often used for secular purposes until public opinion cried shame. The *Lamentations of Scotland* thus bewailed their alienation.



KELSO ABBEY.

these sacred edifices regarded that they were often used for secular purposes until public opinion cried shame. The *Lamentations of Scotland* thus bewailed their alienation.

'The rooms appointed for people to consider,
To hear God's word; where they should pray together—
Are now converted in sheep cots and folds,
Or else are fallen, because none them upholds.
The parish Kirks I ween they sæ misguide
That none for wind and rain 'beruin may bide.'

Still more sad was the fanatical destruction of the Scotch religious houses. It was enough for the multitude that John Knox had said 'the true way of banishing the rooks is to pull down their nests;' and the ruins of Iona, Melrose, Dryburgh, Kelso, Arbroath, Jedburgh, Dumferline, etc., sufficiently attest how thoroughly his maxim was applied. He may not himself have wielded a hammer or an axe to destroy such noble monuments of bygone Scottish devotion, but he stirred the people up to deeds of vigorous iconoclasm at the thought of which we shudder. It is right to remember that the monasteries in Great Britain were not all destroyed by Henry VIII. His commissioners had no authority beyond the Tweed, for Scotland was not then united to England. John Knox proposed to endow a national Presbyterian Church with the revenues of Scotch monasteries, but the Lords of the Congregation circumvented him. "His plan was," they said, "a devout imagination," a visionary scheme, which shewed the goodness of the preacher's intentions, but which it was impossible to carry into practice" (*Scott*). The Scottish Reformation materially differed from that in England. Our land has always retained the ancient Christianity and kept true to the 'Apostolic doctrine and fellowship.' But Scotland, in 1560, by one legislative stroke in a day of fanatical madness, solemnly abjured and repudiated the ancient Catholic faith and worship in order to get rid of papal authority; instead of endeavouring to restore the undoubted independent rights of the ancient Church as was done in England. This matter has been referred to because the prestige of Presbyterianism in Scotland gave the English advocates of the system greater importance; and perhaps may account in some degree for the bitter political opposition to it by the English constitutional party. At the same time we should bear in mind that Calvin's method of Church government was the only definite religious system which presented itself in those days, as an alternative to the Episcopacy which many clergy and laity, who wished to prevent any subsequent efforts of Spain and the Jesuits to re-introduce papal supremacy, were unable to dissociate from Romanism. The cry of '*No Popery*' was bred of a wholesome national antipathy to an odious foreign tyranny; but it was fed and nourished upon an equally foreign idea that everything that had been touched or used by Rome was necessarily false and vicious. Whereas (speaking historically, and apart from the question of her accretions of error and unauthorised dogma) there can be no doubt that the Church of Rome was as much a true and Apostolic branch of the Catholic Church for Italy, as our own National Church is for England. It is equally certain that Calvin's system was quite as intolerant of all other religions as the arrogant papacy; and they were far sighted men who, in the chaos of reforming opinions, were able to perceive that adherence to ancient and orthodox belief and practice, as recently purified from corruption, was the only logical and safe course for the Church in England to pursue.

3. **The Hampton Court Conference.**—As soon as it was known that James VI. of Scotland was to be the English king also, all parties pressed their congratulations upon him and sought to obtain his patronage; but he soon made it plain to them that he would continue to maintain Elizabeth's order of government and procedure. The religious parties at that time were (1) the loyal members of the National Church; (2) the disaffected Romanists, who had not yet given up all hopes of obtaining the kingdom for the pope; and (3) the equally disaffected Puritans, who supposed that the advent of a king who had ruled Presbyterian Scotland would help forward their schemes. The leaders of the latter, comprising the extreme *separatists* and many clergymen within the Church of England who upheld Calvin's theories, drew up a manifesto for presentation to King James (1603). It is known as the *Millenary Petition*, although far less than a thousand ministers had signed it. In it they pleaded for a revision of the Liturgy which should exclude all symbolism (such as the ring in marriage); and all words which



HAMPTON COURT PALACE, *temp.* JAMES I.

gave a sacerdotal character to the clergy, or implied the idea of a sacrifice in their sacramental ministrations. The petition also prayed for liberty not to wear the surplice, and the removal of certain abuses of patronage, non-residence, pluralities and discipline. The result of this Petition was that the king called together an assembly of divines at his palace of *Hampton Court* in January, 1604; at which the Puritans were asked to state their grievances, with a view to their removal if they were found to be real ones. James I. presided. The objections were found to be chiefly against the government of the Church; and in favour of Presbyterianism, as in Scotland, which they contended was best for the peace of the kingdom and the safety of the monarch. But the king had had some experience of its tendency there, and was glad of an opportunity to be rid of it. He seized the first chance to express his opinion that, 'Presbyterianism agreeth as well with monarchy as God and the devil. . . . Let that government be once up we shall all of us have work enough, and both our hands full.' The king had written several theological books before his accession, and was pleased when he could show himself an arbiter of religious questions. His opinion of the Puritans, as

expressed in his speech to his first parliament, was that they were 'schismatics' and 'novelists.' Probably no thought of schism was as yet entertained by the Puritans—but only a desire to impose their views upon other people's consciences. They agreed that there ought to be uniformity, but it must be an uniform observance of doctrine and discipline in accordance with the foreign protestant reforming ideas. James I. was convinced that Presbyterianism was moved by a democratic principle, destined to overthrow monarchy, which ought to be suppressed forthwith as dangerous to the State—and the end proved that his estimate of its principles was correct. The attitude of James was mainly political, but Churchmen were willing enough to be used by him as agents in the suppression of malcontents. To this end the Canons drawn up by Convocation in 1603 were submitted to the clergy for acceptance. Those Canons are still the rules of the English Church; and a perusal of them will show how harmless was their nature.¹ Some have become obsolete by force of custom, but the bulk remain as a standard of practice for the clergy; and they clearly explain the position of those who, at the conference of Hampton Court, contended for the 'ancient customs.' Several minor alterations were made in the Liturgy as the result of the conference, and the latter part of the Catechism was added; but the plain words of the proclamation, printed in the revised issue of the Prayer-Book to which all were bound to conform, will of themselves give us a contemporary idea of the nature of Puritan demands, and the desire of those in authority to defend the ancient usages.

We cannot conceal that the success of that Conference was such as happeneth to many other things, which, moving great expectation before they be entered into, in their issue produce small effects. For we found mighty and vehement informations supported with so weak and slender proofs, as it appeared unto us and our Council, that there was no cause why any change should have been at all in that which was most impugned, the Book of Common-Prayer, containing the form of the public Service of God here established; neither in the doctrine which appeared to be sincere, nor in the Forms and Rites which were justified out of the practice of the Primitive Church. Notwithstanding we thought meet, with consent of the bishops and other learned men there present, that some small things might rather be explained than changed; not that the same might not very well have been borne with by men who would have made a reasonable construction of them; but for that in a matter concerning the Service of God we were nice, or rather jealous, that the public form thereof should be free, not only from blame, but from suspicion; so as neither the common Adversary should have advantage to wrest ought therein contained, to other sense than the Church of England intendeth, nor any troublesome or ignorant person of this Church be able to take occasion of cavil against it."

The Puritans were browbeaten, but in no way convinced, by James at the Conference; and complained that they had been unfairly treated. Archbishop Whitgift died on the last day of February, 1604; and it

1 A reprint of them can be bought from the S.P.C.K. for 1s.

was left for his successor, Richard Bancroft, to enforce the Acts of Uniformity and the tests of subscription which he did with unyielding persistence. Outward conformity, such as Whitgift had been content with, was insufficient; and many clergy who hesitated to declare their hearty willingness (*'ex animo'*) to subscribe the Articles, Canons, and Liturgy were expelled from Church offices. The number of deprivations is said by the Puritans to have been 300, but Archbishop Bancroft stated that there were only 49. Either way we see that the disaffected clergy were an insignificant minority; and discipline was of all things the most essential to the Church's well being. In 1610, when the more tolerant archbishop *Abbott* succeeded Bancroft in the Primacy, and Puritan clergy were allowed to have more latitude in the direction of Calvinism, the most deplorable results ensued; which heightened the contrast made by the efforts of his own successor, *William Laud*, to restore reverence and decency in public worship. We must now turn our attention to the doings of disaffected Romanists.

4. The Gunpowder Treason Plot.—Before Elizabeth's death the popes had come to see the unwisdom of trying to subjugate England by force; and as Clement VIII. had written to James, before the latter came to the throne of England, to assure him of papal support in the event of his accession, there is no reason to suppose that Rome had any share in the conspiracies against the life of James concocted by fanatics who professed obedience to the papacy. Indeed the Jesuit Fathers took care to inform the Government when such a design was discovered by them in 1603. On his part James had promised not to enforce the penal statutes of Elizabeth's reign against Romanists, in return for their acquiescence in his peaceful accession, but he found that public opinion against them in England was too strong for their abolition. When he remitted the fines imposed on *Recusants*¹ he was accused of tampering with 'Antichrist'; and so rapidly did the Jesuits swarm into the country, giving out that James had become a member of the Roman Communion, than which nothing was farther from his thoughts, that he was obliged to send all Romish priests out of the country and strictly enforce the recusancy fines. When the Romanists found that James had no intention to play false with the National Church, certain daring spirits among them conceived the horrible idea of annihilating King, Lords, and Commons by blowing up the Houses of Parliament with gunpowder; on the day that all should be gathered together to hear the king's speech at the opening of the

¹ The Romanists who refused to obey the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity were subject to heavy fines for non-attendance at their parish church on Sundays and holy-days, and were called *recusants*, a French word derived from the Latin *re*, against, and *causa*, a cause. The word was applied to those only who rejected the royal supremacy, and therefore to Romanists chiefly.

legislative session. The chief conspirators were *Robert Catesby*, at whose manor house at Ashby St. Leger the plot was hatched, and *Sir Everard Digby*, who provided most of the funds. None of the conspirators were of mean estate, and they solemnly swore by the Blessed Sacrament not to divulge their plan nor cease to prosecute it until the design was fulfilled. Our illustration shows the London house of Catesby, where the plot was matured. For eighteen months the preparations went on, and no one broke the oath of secrecy. A vault was rented under the Parliament House, and there they stored thirty-six barrels of gunpowder, which they covered over with coals and sticks; and they often left the door wide open to



GUNPOWDER CONSPIRATORS' HOUSE, LAMBETH.

allay suspicion. A few days before Parliament assembled *Lord Mounteagle*, a Romanist peer, was warned by an anonymous letter from the conspirators not to go to the opening ceremony. The letter stated that Parliament should 'receive a terrible blow and not see who hurts them.' Mounteagle showed it to the prime minister, who laid it before the king; and James at once suspected what was intended. The vaults were searched and the gunpowder discovered, but care was taken that none should know that it was found out; and when *Guido Fawkes*, the conspirator who had volunteered to fire the train, repaired to the vault to make his final preparations (Nov. 5, 1605) he was surprised and captured. The other conspirators

aroused suspicion against themselves by absconding from their London lodgings into the country. They were pursued and overtaken; many being killed while fighting desperately, which they preferred to an ignoble surrender; but most of them were made prisoners and reserved for torture and execution. As the result of statements extracted from them a proclamation was issued against certain Jesuit Fathers; and at the end of January, 1606, all the conspirators suffered the extremest penalty provided by statute for the punishment of high treason. This diabolical conspiracy deepened the national aversion against Romanism into indelible hatred. It availed nothing that the majority of Romanists repudiated the plot and regarded it with loathing; for the Parliament which had so narrowly escaped destruction passed still more severe laws against 'popish recusants.' Henceforth a Romanist was not allowed to enter any profession or place of trust; their houses were liable to be visited at all times by the magistrates; and most impolitic of all, they were forced to participate periodically in 'the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper' in their parish church. Thenceforward Romanists ceased to be an element of danger to the State. Outcasts from honourable society, they realised that their personal safety consisted in passive obedience to the law; and it is fair to say that, in spite of the desire of the Puritans, the statutes against them were not severely enforced after the first flood of horror had subsided. The annual demonstrations in memory of that fifth of November, and the regular search still made of the vaults beneath the present Houses of Parliament before the commencement of every session, shows how abiding is the recollection of the danger then averted. So providential was the deliverance felt to be, that a special form of thanksgiving service was annexed to the Book of Common Prayer for use on the anniversary; and remained there until the year 1859. No one can regret its disuse, for the service contained many phrases wanting in Christian charity towards the Church of Rome. Deeply as all must regret the connexion between Romanists and treason plots in days gone by, and however much we may deplore her defection from Apostolic doctrine, we shall not mend matters by our own hard words. A modern poet has taught us a more excellent way

"Speak gently of our sister's fall:

Who knows but gentle love


May win her at our patient call

The surer way to prove?" (*Keble.*)

Meanwhile James I. had prevailed upon the Scots to receive a number of bishops as 'constant moderators' for their Presbyteries. Three Scotchmen were afterwards selected for consecration and sent to London. (A.D. 1610.) The Scotch Parliament had previously restored the episcopal estates that had been seized in the time of John Knox. The Scotch prelates were duly consecrated by the

bishops of London, Worcester, Rochester, and Ely, and empowered to form a High Commission Court for Scotland. On their return to the north they consecrated other bishops; and in 1618 they issued the *Five Perth Articles* which enforced kneeling at the reception of Holy Communion, observance of the great festivals of the Church, instruction of the young in the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Ten Commandments, Private Communion to sick folk, and Private Baptism to children in danger. As yet there was no regular Scotch Liturgy.

5. The Authorised Version.—Although no alteration of consequence took place in the liturgy as the result of the Hampton Court



THE JERUSALEM CHAMBER WESTMINSTER.

Conference, an important retranslation of the Scriptures was decided on. James clearly saw that a new translation would add to the glory of his reign, and heartily welcomed the proposal. Forty-seven scholars were selected from both universities, and the learned clergy of all schools of thought, who were divided into six companies: two of which met at Oxford, two at Cambridge, and two in the Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster Abbey. Each scholar took one chapter at a time for careful revision, and his emendations would be carefully revised by his company and then handed on for final revision to the

other companies in turn. The object was not to make a new translation altogether, for the text of 'Parker's Bible' was to be used as a basis; and it was not to be altered either in phrase or division of chapters, except where necessary for the sake of accuracy. The revisers were allowed to make marginal notes in explanation of Hebrew and Greek words, and insert cross references to parallel passages in other parts of the Bible, but the king instructed the revisers that no other marginal comments should be added, because he had found in the Genevan translation 'some notes very partial, untrue, seditious, and savouring too much of dangerous and traitorous conceits.' No pains were spared by the translators, and no time begrudged, for the work was a labour of love; and in the year 1611 they published that which has ever since been considered the greatest treasure of English literature; known to us as the *Authorised Version* of the Bible; which is still used by Churchmen and Non-conformists alike as the pure Word of God—'able to make us wise unto Salvation.' Thus the English Bible is the gift to the world of scholars belonging to the Church of England; and as the Scriptures have in all ages been her standard of duty, nothing will be found in her doctrines or services opposed to its spirit or plain teaching. The 1611 Version was the first Bible printed in the modern Roman type; all previous editions were in 'Old English' characters. The laudatory preface 'To the most high and mighty prince James,' still printed at the beginning of the English Bible, serves to show how impossible it was in those days to avoid extravagant flattery of patrons. A final reference may here be made to the necessity of Biblical revisions. With the changes of custom as ages rolled along came the adaptation of old words to new meanings, and of new words to things old; while intercourse with other countries caused the incorporation of foreign words into our vernacular; until many ancient words appeared obsolete, and modern ones were required to express the older sense. But there is a greater reason than this why the authorised translation of the Scriptures should be revised from time to time; as was recently done in the same Jerusalem Chamber at Westminster, whence the *Revised Version* was issued, the New Testament in 1881 and the Old Testament in 1885. The friendship of our country with other lands has enabled us to compare the manuscripts from which earlier translations were made with still more ancient manuscripts preserved in foreign theological libraries. The careful collation of these manuscripts, so as to find out which passages have the greatest authority and which are doubtful, has enabled modern scholars to furnish us with a much more exact transcript than the means available 300 years ago could do; and therefore, in spite of its frequent interference with the rhythm of the older translation, the Revised Version will always be preferred by those who value accuracy, although it may not be publicly read in Church services. Those who consider the modern revision unsuc-

cessful, because it is not issued with authority, should remember that it took many years for the 'Authorised' Version to win its way into public favour; for many continued to use the older versions which they had learned to love, just as many people now, forgetting that all English Versions are merely translations from the ancient Hebrew and Greek, imagine each word and letter of the 1611 translation to be a voice from God. On the other hand, the fact that so many still prefer the version dedicated to James I. may be taken as proof that in spite of the flood of criticism and abuse heaped upon it by grammarians, scholars, and fault-finders generally, its rhythmical cadences that fall so pleasantly on our accustomed ears are remarkably true to the original; and that no great doctrine taught by it has been given up by the most searching comparisons of recent days. One who in our own generation left his ancestral Church of England for the Roman Communion (*Dr. Faber*) must have mingled heartfelt regrets in his retrospect of the past when he wrote of the Authorized Version that "it lives on the ear like a music which can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert scarce knows how he can forego. Its felicities seem often to be almost things rather than words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of the national seriousness. . . . The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. It is the representative of a man's best moments; all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good speaks to him for ever out of his English Bible."

6. The Puritans.—King James had closed the Hampton Court Conference with this parting threat to the Puritans:—"I will make them conform, or harry them out of the land." Consequently many of the ministers who refused subscription to the acts of uniformity or the canons ecclesiastical and were deprived, together with numerous upholders who declined to attend the parish church, found a home elsewhere, at first in Holland and afterwards beyond the Atlantic. The first permanent settlement of Englishmen in America was in Virginia (A.D. 1607-8); though that was not a colony of religious refugees, but an incorporated company under royal charter, whose members conducted their religious worship on Church of England lines exclusively. In 1620 a band of Separatists sailed in the *Mayflower* from Leyden, in Holland, and after encountering many hardships landed on the eastern coast of America, inside Cape Cod, at a place they called *Plymouth*, in memory of the last English land they had seen, and that little colony became the nucleus of what are now the 'New England' States. Ten years later there commenced to flow from Old England a constant stream of harassed Puritans, with *John Winthrop* for their head, and these founded the cities of *Boston*, Mass., 1630; *Providence*, R.I., 1636; and *Newhaven*, Conn., 1638, By 1640 it was computed that twenty thousand emigrants had found

their way thither. These 'Pilgrim Fathers,' as they are sometimes called, are still revered by many as patriarchs of the United States; and in their colonisation of its eastern shores we may trace the mysterious workings of the Almighty. But they were not

content with founding a home where religious toleration might be had, but insisted on making their own intolerant Puritanism supreme and exclusive. All who declined to accept their interpretation of doubtful passages of Scripture were banished from the colony, and any who, having accepted it, sinned against their moral code, were rigorously punished.¹ In spite of their intolerance it was the need of peace and personal piety which caused them to find a new home. The age they lived in was vicious in the extreme, and there were no longer any monastic societies in which austerity of life could be cultivated. The frivolity of the time was expressed in the silks and satins, frills and velvets worn by gentlemen; while its graver vices were openly manifested by intemperance, evil speaking, and unchastity.



PURITAN COSTUMES.

order to escape from such temptations to sin were better advised than those who remained in England to lay the vices of their day at the door of episcopacy in order to supplant it. The Puritans felt it incumbent upon them to dress in simple attire of sombre hue, and crop their

1 "We shall seek in vain for a parallel to the massacre of the Pequod Indians. It brought out the worst point in the Puritan character. . . . The intolerance with which the Puritans had been treated at home might at least have taught them a lesson of forbearance to each other. But it had no such effect."—Marsden's *History of the Puritans*," pp. 304, 305.

hair close by way of contrast to the fashionable follies ; and when King James issued his famous *Book of Sports* (1618) as a corrective to the objectionable revels of social gatherings, or local fairs and festivals, they responded by publications in which all pleasures, amusements, and personal adornments were declared sinful. Of their conscientiousness and zeal there can be no doubt at all, and we need not comment upon their ostentatious pretensions to higher spirituality than other folk. What we deplore is their defection from the paths of Catholic antiquity in favour of novel systems of worship and doctrine. Their affectation was an exaggeration of the truth that man has a personal relationship with the Creator, from which they argued that each individual was called upon to settle for himself the form of worship most suited to his own condition. This attitude was taken up specially by the separatists who in time were called *Independents* ; and they were as much opposed to Presbyterianism as they were to Episcopacy, simply because they objected to every religious organisation or government, each preferring to be a law unto himself.

7. **Abbott and Laud.**—Archbishop Abbott had made his house 'a sanctuary for the most eminent of the factious party, and he licensed their most pernicious writings' (*Clarendon*), so that he soon lost the favour of King James. But not before he had shown that he could be intolerant and cruel, by assisting to revive the statute for burning heretics. In 1612 two poor men were burnt for their religious opinions :—*Bartholomew Legate*, at Smithfield, March 3 ; and *Edward Wightman*, at Lichfield, April 11 ; for propagating Arian interpretations of certain passages in Scripture. It was many years since people had been so put to death, and so indignant were the people that it was never resorted to again for heresy. When Abbott went into retirement the chief religious adviser of the crown was *Dr. Williams*, bishop of Lincoln ; who received the great seal also (after Lord Chancellor Bacon had been impeached for flagrant bribery), and in the next reign became archbishop of York. The favourite at court was the versatile and immoral *Villiers* Duke of Buckingham ; whose steps were dogged by the greatest in the land whenever they wanted any piece of promotion. Under Williams and Buckingham an anti-Calvinistic party in the Church came into favour, which was nicknamed *Arminian*, although there is nothing to show that its leaders were in any way connected with the Dutch movement properly so called.¹ The spiritually-minded bishop of

¹ *James Harmensen*, Latin *Arminius*, was a professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden. His opinions were opposed to Calvin's theories on the Five points of Election, Redemption, Free Will, Grace, and Final Perseverance. He died in 1609, and his views were condemned at the Calvinistic *Synod of Dort*, A.D. 1618 ; to which James I. sent, as representing the English Church, the Bishop of Llandaff, the dean of Worcester, and two Cambridge professors. The English movement was quite independent of him and his works.

Ely, *Lancelot Andrews*, following in the wake of Richard Hooker, may be considered the father of the party, although not its chief exponent. The object of its members was to resist the advance of Calvinistic principles, as seen in Presbyterianism, by an appeal to history, reason, and Scripture; so as to demonstrate that Episcopacy is a divinely ordered form of Church government, that the Church of England in her organisation, discipline, ceremonial, doctrine and liturgy could claim relationship to the Apostolic Church by an unbroken lineage, and that her reforms, and repudiation of papal control, did not put her out of harmony with other National branches of the Holy Catholic Church. This involved an admission that the Church of Rome, though greatly corrupted, was a true lineal descendant of the Apostolic Church for Italy; and the national dread of anything that tended to exalt or excuse the papacy brought a torrent of abuse on those who taught such principles. These deductions were not new, and they were undeniably just and accurate, but it may be doubted whether their exponents were wise or right in enforcing them to their logical conclusions at such a time. The leader of the historic party was *William Laud*, who as fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, had broken many a controversial lance with Abp. Abbott, when the latter was Master of University College in that city. He had been made chaplain to James I. in 1611; and in 1616 the king gave him the deanery of Gloucester, where the cathedral had been so much neglected that James said to Laud: 'Scarce ever a church in England is so ill governed and so much out of order.' Laud at once proceeded to set things right by repairing the grand edifice (as he afterwards did the cathedral church of St. Paul in London), promoting reverence in worship, and removing the Communion Table from the body of the church to the east end. At once a cry of 'popery' was raised by some, and Laud was designated 'a priest of Baal' by others. But he had convinced himself that obedience to the canon-law of the Church was binding on all her members, and not even for his bishop would he bow to the storm. He braved it with the aid of the High Commission court, with the result that the services of the cathedral were rendered rubrically, though much ill feeling was engendered. In 1621 Laud was made bishop of St. David's, and the following year held a public disputation with a learned Jesuit named *Fisher*, which King James and Buckingham attended, in which, following Hooker and Andrews, he showed that Church of England doctrines were more than a system of negations; for that they had been grounded upon Holy Scripture, were in accordance with primitive Christianity, justified by human reason, and approved by inward conviction. The ability with which Laud conducted this controversy with Fisher increased the favour in which he already stood at court, and from that time he was the chief ecclesiastical adviser of the Crown.

8. Progress of Opposing Principles.—The Puritans were very bitter at Laud's rapid advancement, and endeavoured to throw all the odium of political disturbances upon the party which he favoured. They saw that toleration was being extended to Romanists, that the penal laws were not strictly enforced against them, and that recusancy fines were often remitted. Negotiations had long been pending for a marriage between Prince Charles, the son of James I., and a Spanish princess, which the nation resented; and although they came to nothing they served to put the country in a ferment. The popular antipathy increased when in 1623



WILLIAM LAUD.

the Pope was allowed to send a bishop *in partibus* to superintend the English Romanists, who was known as the *Bishop of Chalcedon*. The Spanish Armada and the Gunpowder Treason were still fresh in living memories, and any leanings towards toleration for or reconciliation with recusants, or approximation to their modes of worship, however historical or primitive, was considered by many to be dangerous to the peace of the realm. Moreover, James I. was engaged in a struggle with his Parliament. His ideas of the 'Divine Right' of kings led him to consider himself irresponsible to the people,

and when he refused to give an account to Parliament for certain acts which they considered outside his prerogative they refused to provide him with the necessary funds for keeping up the court and carrying on affairs of state in peace or war. Because the lovers of Church order and reverence desired to enforce obedience to canon-law they upheld the authority of the Crown; while those who wished to be free from all restraint in religion sided with the Parliament. Thus two opposing parties were rapidly becoming established: the *Anglo-Catholic*, which identified itself with absolute monarchy, and the *Puritan*, which was jealous of the liberties of Parliament. And

whereas King James had exceeded his prerogative in levying taxes without consent of the legislature, so did Parliament exceed its rights in meddling with religious affairs. Many time-serving and sycophant clergy had flattered the all-powerful Buckingham to obtain preferment, thus bringing the Church party into discredit; and many earnest, godly-minded preachers, who were shocked at the corruptions at court and in society, identified themselves with the separatists. Apart from politics the Church of England was invulnerable, because it had the intellectual breadth and guidance of sixteen centuries of Christian thought and discipline; but Puritanism apart from politics had no element of cohesion whatever. Yet there was so close an intimacy between the civil and ecclesiastical relations of the Stuart times, that a distinct advantage was acquired by the opponents of Church principles all the time the monarchy persisted in asserting its absolute right to rule without question or control. How great a matter may be kindled by a small fire is aptly illustrated by the undue prominence given to the writings of a parish priest named *Richard Mountagu*. The Parliament which met in 1624 was well known for its Puritan bias, and it received a petition from some Calvinistic lecturer respecting a pamphlet called '*A new gag for an old goose*,' which Mountagu had written against some Jesuits who were proselytising in his parish. It was merely a reply, though coarse and ill-judged, to a brochure of the Jesuits, who had supposed certain Puritan fancies to be Church of England doctrines. In it he took the strongest possible ground for overthrowing the arguments of his Jesuit opponents by admitting that the Church of Rome was a true Church, although corrupt, and claiming for the English Church an equally historic though less superstitious position. This was in reality the position taken up by Hooker, and Andrews, and Laud. When Parliament proceeded to inquire into the matter, Mountagu denied its right to judge matters of doctrine, and appealed to the king. In the midst of the controversy King James died (March 27, 1625), and when Parliament met again Mountagu had been made chaplain to Charles I. The new king had also married the sister of the king of France, a pronounced Romanist, who brought with her a crowd of French attendants and some Romish priests; so that the Puritanical element was thoroughly roused. When Charles asked Parliament for money to carry on the war against Spain, which the Duke of Buckingham had rashly entered on, it only voted an insignificant sum; and spent much time in discussing and condemning Mr. Mountagu's new book, '*An appeal to Cæsar*.' Charles angrily dissolved that Parliament and called another (1626), but with no better success; for it impeached the Duke of Buckingham, and returned to the charge against Mountagu's book. To save his favourite minister the king at once dissolved his second Parliament, and had recourse to the system of forced loans to raise money for his expeditions. Those who would not pay he

imprisoned, and the court chaplains were set to preach in favour of this unconstitutional proceeding. They did so with vigour, and returned the compliment of James I., '*No bishop, no king,*' with compound interest in terms of which we are now ashamed. *Dr. Sibthorpe*, e.g., preached an assize sermon at Northampton inculcating the duty of passive obedience to the king even when his commands were opposed to Scripture. Archbishop Abbott was asked by the king to license it and declined. The primate was suspended for refusing. A *Dr. Mainwaring* also, rector of St. Giles' Cripplegate, maintained that regal power was a participation of Divine omnipotence, and that Parliament was merely an assistant of the Crown. Laud remonstrated against this extravagant exaltation of the prerogative, but the sermon was published by the king's command and provoked much ill feeling.

CHAPTER XXII. (A.D. 1625-1649).

KING *versus* PARLIAMENT.

"Weep, oh! weep,
Weep with the good, beholding king and priest,
Forsaken by the God to whom they raise
Their suppliant hands. But holy is the feast
He keepeth, like the firmament His ways,
His statutes like the chambers of the deep."—*Wordsworth*.

1. *The Petition of Right*.—No one need doubt the sincerity and uprightness of Charles I. From infancy he was trained to believe in the 'divine right of kings,' he placed implicit trust in his father's counsellors, and believed every word that Sibthorpe and Mainwaring preached in the sermons just referred to. That he was grievously misled we now know well, and we are willing to excuse some of the results of that misdirection in return for his unfailing loyalty to the National Church; but it would be wrong to conceal the fact that the subsequent troubles were caused by his ill-advised policy. The rash expeditions against Spain had failed; and the French attendants of the queen were stirring up strife at court, because penal laws against the recusants continued in force; although the marriage had been arranged on secret conditions that they should be withdrawn. That of course the country would never have allowed, and the queen's attendants and clergy were driven out of England. The result was a war with France, and more money was needed which Charles tried to raise by forced loans. Buckingham led the first expedition against the French by attempting to relieve the Huguenot stronghold of *La Rochelle* which the great French

statesman, *Cardinal Richelieu*, was at the time besieging ; and having failed disastrously returned to England for further supplies of money and men. As there was no hope of raising funds without consent of the legislature, Charles called together a third Parliament (1628) ; but the members refused to grant any subsidies until their ancient privileges were restored. They objected to Laud's opening sermon, and proceeded to appoint a committee of religion to discuss the writings of Mountagu and Mainwaring, together with a devotional book for private use which *John Cosin* had composed by the king's request to counteract the pernicious tendencies of the devotional manuals introduced at court by the queen's ladies. Mainwaring was prosecuted before the House of Lords, heavily fined, and suspended from ministerial functions, his sermons being condemned by proclamation ; but the king retorted by remitting the fine, revoking the suspension, and presenting the offender to a valuable benefice. Parliament then threw all the blame of their civil grievances on Buckingham, and drew up the famous *Petition of Right* which provided (1) That no freeman be required to give any gift, loan, benevolence, or tax, without common consent by Act of Parliament ; (2) That no freeman be imprisoned or detained without trial or cause shewn ; (3) That soldiers and mariners should not be billeted in private houses or punished by martial law. Charles was obliged to assent to this petition or bill in order to obtain the necessary subsidies. It was an effectual check to the absolutism of the Stuarts. Charles hoped that his friend Buckingham might regain popularity by a second and more successful attempt to relieve La Rochelle ; but the favourite was murdered before he could leave Portsmouth by a man named John Felton, who hoped thus to do his country a service. Parliament next drew up a *Remonstrance* against the 'Arminian' clergy, especially Bishop Neile of Winchester and Bishop Laud ; which the king warmly resented. He at once prorogued Parliament, and immediately afterwards Laud was made Bishop of London, and Mountagu Bishop of Chichester. The Calvinists now gained ground so rapidly that the king was advised by Laud to prefix a *Declaration* to the thirty-nine articles (it is still printed before them in our Prayer-book), which declared Convocation to be the proper body to order and settle ecclesiastical affairs ; that only the plain, literal and grammatical sense shall be put upon the articles ; and that all disputations respecting them should cease. This brought matters to a climax. There had also been a discussion as to the meaning of the *Petition of Right* : the Commons alleging that the king was thereby prohibited from levying taxes of any kind, while the king claimed that as it did not expressly mention import duties of tunnage on wine, and poundage on certain other commodities, he had still the right to levy and appropriate those duties. In the recess several London merchants refused to pay the customs duties and were imprisoned. When Parliament reassembled a

direct attack was, not unnaturally, made upon the Declaration. The House of Commons resolved itself into a Committee of Religion; and a Mr. Rouse proposed that Parliament should take a solemn vow, by which all interpretation of the articles that differed in any way from the Calvinistic sense was to be rejected; Mr. Pym, in support, declaring that Parliament alone had the right 'to establish true religion.' The latter seemed to think that the Lambeth Articles (page 98), which had never been in any way recognized by the Church, were the only true tests of doctrine. The House worded its vow accordingly; and summoned to the bar some clergy who had presumed to carry out the services of the Church in accordance with the rubrics; especially Cosin, and others, who had tried to set Durham Cathedral in order. Pending their arrival the Commons considered the question of tunnage and poundage, and cited the custom-house officers to their bar for having detained the merchandise of one Rolle who happened to be a member of Parliament. It seemed as if they wanted members engaged in trade to be free from the imposts other merchants had to pay; for they deliberately rejected Pym's advice to make a general claim for all men to be freed from duties not imposed by Parliament, and persisted in treating the affair as a question of privilege, by which their own members were aggrieved; although their House had not been deprived of Rolle's services, seeing that the seizure took place when Parliament was not sitting, and that the House had never made any decree on the subject. Charles I. protected the customs officers as having obeyed his orders, and commanded the adjournment of the House until March 2. On that day there was a great tumult, and Sir John Eliot moved a resolution that 'whoever should bring in religious innovations, or seek to extend or introduce Popery or Arminianism, or levy taxes without consent of Parliament should be reputed a capital enemy to the kingdom and commonwealth.' The speaker wished to adjourn the House, but two members, Holles and Valentine, held him down in his chair by force, while another locked the doors to keep the House in session. The king was kept informed of the proceedings, and when he heard of the speaker's powerlessness he went to the House accompanied by his guards, arriving just in time to hear the vociferous shouts of 'aye! aye!' which indicated that the resolution was passed. He at once dissolved the Parliament, and did not call another for eleven years.

2. Arbitrary Civil Government.—The first thing after the dissolution of Parliament was to bring Eliot, Holles, Valentine, and others before the Court of King's Bench. They were charged with riot and sedition, but they refused to acknowledge the authority of the tribunal. For refusing to pay the fines imposed they were committed to the Tower, where ultimately Eliot died and was buried. He was not strong, and imprisonment doubtless hastened his end.

He firmly believed that Parliament was the controlling power of the Constitution and independent of the king. Charles felt that if the estates of the Realm were not subject to his rule his kingly dignity would be at an end. It was a struggle between Parliamentary and monarchical despotism. The chief advisers of Charles henceforward were Bishop Laud and Viscount Wentworth, afterwards *Earl of Strafford*, whom the king had won over from the Opposition to the cause of absolute monarchy (1630). Strafford sought to govern by military rule. Weston was Lord Treasurer at the time and he proposed all manner of schemes for replenishing the exhausted exchequer. One of the most unpopular was the revival of ship money; a tax often imposed in times of national danger, such as the Spanish



JOHN HAMPDEN'S HOUSE, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

invasion, and claimed now on the ground that a fleet was necessary to guard the coasts from pirates. But whereas in former times the tax was a temporary expedient, and furnished chiefly by the seaport towns in the shape of ships fully equipped for service, Weston made it permanent; and claimed money equivalents from landed proprietors in every county upon a systematic basis. Many murmured at the imposition and some deliberately refused to pay, among them being a Buckinghamshire squire named *John Hampden*. A lawsuit was entered against him in the king's name before twelve judges in the Court of Exchequer. Five judges agreed with Hampden's counsel that the king could not impose ship money as a regular tax without the consent of Parliament; but the other seven decided that acts

of Parliament could not bind the king as to when and how taxes should be raised to meet the necessities of state and therefore Hampden lost the day. Notwithstanding the nation felt that his interpretation of the law was just and so he became the hero of the hour. (A.D. 1637.) Strafford had been made Viceroy of Ireland and Lord President of the north. He wielded absolute power in the king's name, and compelled obedience through fear; caring nothing that his tyranny was heaping up future retribution against himself.

3. Laud's Administration.—There can be no question as to the severity with which Laud proceeded to enforce ecclesiastical discipline after the dissolution of Parliament, but we must try not to misunderstand the position of affairs. Laud had the Prayer-book and the Acts of Uniformity on his side; and most of those to whom he was opposed wished to ignore the one and alter the other. It was not a question of toleration, but a question as to which side of religious opinion should have the right and power of compelling uniformity. Each party believed that its existence depended upon the repression of the other; and Laud worked resolutely from a high sense of duty when he set himself to purge the historical Christianity of England from the stern and cold Puritanism that had been introduced from foreign reformed Churches, and allowed to run riot under Archbishops Grindal and Abbott. From the beginning to the end of his career Laud never wavered. The principles he enunciated at Oxford he carried into practice at Gloucester, St. David's, Bath and Wells, and London; and now that he had unlimited powers accorded to him by the king, and the opportunity of enforcing discipline by means of the High Commission Court and punishing offenders in the Court of the Star Chamber, he used his great power without a thought of consequences; although he was sensible that failure meant death. This much should be said in favour of Wentworth and of Laud: that they were altogether careless of popularity, and never wavered in their determination to do what they felt to be just and right when persons of high social position were charged before them. In after days when called to account for his administration Laud said, "I laboured nothing more than that the external public worship of God—too much slighted in most parts of this kingdom—might be preserved, and that with as much decency and uniformity as might be; being still of opinion that unity cannot long continue in the Church, when uniformity is shut out at the church door." It is a great mistake to suppose that Laud desired to introduce novel ceremonies; and he never went beyond the rubrics, canons, and statute-law of England, as laid down in the courts of his day, when striving to set his dioceses in order, and to regulate his province after he became primate in succession to Abbott. (A.D. 1633.) But it is possible to strain the law harshly: and this undoubtedly Laud did by imposing the severest penalties allowed in

an unmerciful age; as when a Mr. Sherfield was fined £500 for breaking a stained glass window in a church near Salisbury. A rigid censorship of the press was carried on, and exaggerated punishments were meted out to those who ventured to publish any books or pamphlets against the Church or the king; as when in 1630 *Dr. Alexander Leighton* was flogged and earcropped for libeling the queen and attacking the bishops in a book against prelacy. The *Book of Sports*¹ which King James had issued in 1618, to license certain games on Sundays and Holy-days after service time, had been made the basis of a furious attack by the Puritans; and the Chief Justice Richardson, in his assize circuit in Somersetshire in




THE STAR CHAMBER.

¹ It should not be thought that this *Book of Sports* introduced Sabbath breaking. In reality it restricted it. Allthrough Elizabeth's reign bull-baiting and bear-baiting took place on Sunday afternoons, and the introduction of healthful recreation less cruel and barbaric was a distinct gain to morality. At the same time it allowed many sports that would not be permitted now. The Church of England in our own day has taken up the subject of Lord's Day Observance in a very different spirit. Against the pernicious customs of modern times she has resolutely set her face; as appears by the following utterance of the Lambeth Conference of 1888—"The due observance of Sunday as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching, has a direct bearing on the moral well-being of the Christian community. We have observed of late a growing laxity which threatens to impair its sacred character. We strongly deprecate this tendency. We call upon the leisurely classes not selfishly to withdraw from others the opportunities of rest and religion. We call upon master and employer jealously to guard the privileges of the servant and the workman. In 'the Lord's Day' we have a priceless heritage. Whoever misuses it incurs a terrible responsibility."

1633, had prohibited their continuance; and even went so far as to command the clergy to announce his prohibition during service time; a piece of interference with ecclesiastical affairs that brought upon him such a stern reproof from the archbishop that he exclaimed, as he left the council chamber whither he had been summoned, "I have almost been choked with a pair of lawn sleeves." The outcome of this was an official republication of the Book of Sports which the clergy were imperatively commanded to make known to their assembled congregations. The object of the book was to promote healthy and manly exercises for the lower classes at times when enforced idleness would have driven them into the ale houses; but to many of the Puritan clergy and laity it seemed to be a direct incentive to breaches of the fourth commandment. Some clergy refused to publish the order in church and were deprived for disobedience. The sturdiest Puritan of that age was a lawyer named *Prynne*, who wrote many books to satirise the fashionable levities of his time; notably a book called *Histriomastix* or 'Scourge of Stage Players' in which he not only protested against the questionable dramas of the day, but abused the bishops and libelled the queen. Other men followed his example in writing and printing scurrilous libels against the government and the Church, as did a Puritan clergyman named *Burton* and a medical man called *Bastwick*. They were brought before the Star Chamber Court and each sentenced to pay £5,000 fine, to stand in the public pillory and have their ears cut off, and then incarcerated for life in distant prisons. It is unfair to charge Laud with the chief responsibility of this cruelty. Mutilation was not considered an excessive punishment in an age when men were hanged for stealing a sheep; and Laud's position as a judge in the Star Chamber Court, which he shared with others, did not give him the right to create laws and penalties, but only the right to administer existing law; and there is no reason to suppose he was at all vindictive to individuals or cruel by nature because of his stern disciplinary measures. The more favourable side of his administration in England may be summed up thus: he endeavoured to enforce the uniform use of the surplice in the church services, the restoration of the 'Communion Tables' to their original position at the east end of the churches, the attendance at service of parishioners at least once every Sunday, and the suppression of the Calvinistic lectureships which had been set up in opposition to the proper parochial ministry. This was done by means of a general visitation of his province A.D. 1633-36. The result was orderly uniformity where chaos had reigned before, but it was only an outward conformity prompted by fear of consequences.

4. The Scotch Liturgy.—Laud had often been disturbed by the thought that in Scotland no attention was being paid to Catholic antiquity or uniformity in public worship. He had accompanied

James I. to Scotland in 1620 and Charles I. in 1633. On the first occasion he had desired to impose the English Liturgy upon the half Episcopal, half Presbyterian Kirk, but James had restrained his zeal. Charles was more amenable to Laud's influence, and knew very little of the Scottish character. It was therefore arranged that a *Service-book* should be compiled with the assistance of the Scotch divines. When published it was found to be very similar to the English Prayer-book, but different in several important points; the variations being caused by a desire to incorporate some parts of the ancient Greek Liturgy, so as to make the book more approximate to the doctrines of the Universal Church before the disunion of East and West. Laud would have preferred an uniform use of the English Book pure and simple throughout the three kingdoms; but he was overruled. Many Scotchmen objected to all forms of prayer, and busily spread abroad many inaccurate reports of Laud's intentions. The introduction of the Service Book was most unwisely preceded by the enforcement of the English canon-law without the concurrence of the Scottish clergy. An adverse public opinion had therefore condemned the use of the Prayer-book before its publication and quite apart from its merits: indeed in absolute ignorance of its contents. A rumour was persistently circulated that the Mass was to be introduced at the bidding of an English archbishop who had sold himself to the pope and the devil; whereas the old objections to the Mass were to the Communion Service being in a foreign tongue and to the adoration of the elements, neither of which objections could be truthfully alleged against the new Scotch Liturgy. Without attempting in any way to disprove the rumours, and without



ST GILES'S, EDINBURGH, BEFORE RESTORATION.

paying any attention whatever to public opinion, Laud went straight forward in the course he felt to be right; and on the sole authority of the king and bishops, without the assent of the Scottish Parliament or of the General Assembly of the Kirk, and without making any provision to maintain order in case of organized disturbance, the new book was ordered to be used in every parish throughout Scotland on and after Easter-Day, 1637. At the last moment its use was postponed until July, and on the 23rd of that month (the Seventh Sunday after Trinity) it was used for the first time in the Cathedral of St. Giles's, Edinburgh, in the presence of the Scotch bishops. A wild mob had gathered within and without the church at the time of morning service; but the dean, who read prayers, had hardly reached the collect for the day when an old market woman named *Jenny Geddes* flung the stool on which she had been sitting at his head. This was the signal for a riot. The windows of the church were smashed, and the clergy maltreated; the Bishop of Edinburgh hardly escaping with his life. This was but the prelude to a general resistance throughout Scotland, and not until it was too late was any attempt at conciliation made by Charles and Laud. Numerous petitions were forwarded to the king and council against the Prayer-book and the canons, which received no attention; till at last the Scotch resolved to take the law in their own hands, and do away with Service-book, bishops, and all; and revert to the Presbyterian system pure and simple, which John Knox had introduced.

5. War with Scotland.—On the 1st March, 1638, the National Covenant drawn up in 1580 against Rome was revived, and subscribed by nineteen-twentieths of the Scottish people; not because every one was stupid enough to suppose that the bishops were Romanists and the Prayer-book the Mass, but because they felt that in imposing the liturgy upon the Scotch without the consent of their Parliament the king had disregarded their ancient rights and liberties. The Scotch now insisted upon subscription to the *Solemn League and Covenant* as the only basis of common intercourse with one another or with England; and appealed to arms in support of their resolution. The General Assembly of Scotland, in which the Presbyterian ministers outnumbered the lay representatives in the proportion of 144 to 96, then assumed the direction of affairs; not with the view of obtaining religious liberty, but in order that absolute conformity to Presbyterianism, under penalties, should be enforced upon all Scotchmen. Civil war was unavoidable, and both sides prepared for the contest; but while the Scotch readily offered their money and persons for their cause, and did not disdain to accept pecuniary aid from the French, the English soldiers were half-hearted and ill provisioned. Charles I. was compelled to make peace upon the first opportunity, and allow the Scots to regulate their own ecclesiastical affairs by a new General Assembly in concurrence with the Scottish

Parliament. But Charles soon became dissatisfied with the Scotch deliberations, because they only confirmed and enforced the covenant; so Strafford was sent for from Ireland, where he had succeeded in compelling an obedience to English rule, that he might help to reduce the Scotch to order. Strafford advised that the English Parliament should again be called together, hoping that its loyalty would be aroused to the extent of provisioning a new army to fight the Scots. But when the new Parliament met (April 1640) it declined to consider anything until its own grievances were redressed, and the war with Scotland abandoned. The king at once dissolved it. Convocation had always sat concurrently with Parliament and been dissolved at the same time. But on that occasion Convocation continued to sit after Parliament was dissolved, in order that the clergy, who had all along supported the Crown policy, might vote their more willing subsidies in the shape of a 'benevolence' for the king's necessity. This was felt to be an illegal proceeding, although the judges pronounced in its favour; so a new writ was issued authorizing the members to sit and act during the king's pleasure under the name of a *Synod*. This assembly proceeded to make new canons to enforce the policy of Laud, one of which was to prevent Scotch disaffection from spreading into England—by imposing the following oath upon the clergy:—

"I ——, do swear that I approve the doctrine and discipline or government established in the Church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any popish doctrine contrary to that which is so established; nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by archbishops bishops, deans, and archdeacons, *et cetera*, as it now stands established."

Popular opinion at once cried out against the *et cetera* clause, as if it imposed an oath requiring approval of something left blank and undefined; whereas the objectionable word meant nothing, being only a careless error. The oath was not enforced, but it furnished occasion for the Puritan politicians to stir up enmity against the Church; and when the Scotch defeated the royal forces at *Newburn-on-Tyne*, August 28, 1640, discontent against the Government and Church had reached its highest pitch. Charles then called a council of peers to advise him what to do; but as they declined to act apart from the House of Commons, the unhappy king was obliged to issue writs for a general election.

6. The Long Parliament.—On November 3, 1640, the new legislative body came together and was found to contain a large majority of members opposed to the policy of the Government and the English Episcopate. They knew that the king's financial necessities were urgent, and they knew also that by declining to vote subsidies until their own privileges were secured, they stood a better

chance of obtaining the king's consent. Their leader was John Pym ; and their first business was to impeach Lord Strafford for his civil government, and obtain his committal to the Tower. Their second business was to release the Puritan libellers—Prynne, Burton, Leighton, Bastwick and others—from prison ; and compensate them handsomely out of the estates of the prelates who had been their judges. Then Dr. Cosin of Durham was impeached before the Lords for superstitious practices, but was acquitted. The *Et cetera* Oath and other canons of the recent synod were declared illegal. On November 10 petitions began to roll in against Archbishop Laud, and on December 18 the Commons accused him before the Lords of high treason. He was then arrested and shortly after sent to the Tower. Other bishops who had been strict in their discipline were accused in like manner, though permitted to be at large under heavy bail. Parliament then issued a commission to deface and demolish all monuments, images, altars, and painted windows in the churches ; and appointed a committee of religion to consider objections to the Church's system of government and worship. The next event (March, 1641) was the trial of Strafford in the House of Lords ; but as it was difficult to prove charges of treason against him by the ordinary legal processes, a special Act of Parliament, called a Bill of Attainder, was passed by the Commons against him, by which sentence of death could be carried out without further trouble (April 21). The House of Lords gave a reluctant assent to the measure (May 7), but it still required the king's assent. It was a hard trial for Charles to be called upon to consent to the summary execution of an adviser whose ministerial life had been wholly spent in faithfully serving him, especially as he had given Strafford a solemn promise of protection ; but Parliament was clamorous for his death and Charles gave way to it (May 10). When Strafford heard that his fate was sealed he exclaimed, "Put not your trust in princes." He was beheaded May 12. A pathetic description has been left us of Strafford's journey from the dungeon to the scaffold. He had to pass the prison window of his late colleague in the government, Archbishop Laud, so he stopped by appointment to receive the primate's blessing. But Laud was unable to speak a word for sorrow, and could only bestow the desired benediction with his outstretched and trembling hands. Strafford's death was the first important limitation of absolute monarchy. The same day that Charles signed the Bill of Attainder against Strafford he made a still more fatal concession, by giving his Assent to another bill by which it became illegal for the legislative body to be dissolved without its own consent. As the Parliament then sitting withheld its consent for many years it obtained the significant name of the *Long Parliament*. Thus fortified the House of Commons proceeded to revenge itself upon the Church of England and the king. By the end of July statutes had been passed abolishing the

Star Chamber and High Commission Courts, and others prohibiting the hateful ship-money and the customs' duties. The Scots then received an indemnity and the opposing armies were disbanded.

7. Outbreak of the Civil War.—It soon became apparent that Charles did not intend to keep faith with Parliament; and therefore further guarantees were demanded. A *Grand Remonstrance* was passed on Nov. 22, consisting of 206 clauses, setting forth the autocratic and unwise proceedings of Charles I. and his advisers since the beginning of his reign; and demanding safeguards against any recurrence thereof. This document was printed by order of the House and scattered broadcast over the land. It was in fact an appeal to the people to vindicate the Parliament against the king. Charles was in the country at the time, but he immediately returned to London and instructed the attorney-general to prefer a charge of treason against five leaders in the House of Commons—Hampden, Pym, Holles, Haselrig, and Strode, but this the House would not permit. The king then went down to the House with a guard to arrest them in person, but a friendly messenger preceded him, and on the king's arrival the members had escaped. London had all along favoured Parliament, and now turned out in arms to help the Commons. The king then went to the provinces with the intention of raising an army to subdue his adversaries by force. The Commons suspecting his design demanded the charge of all fortified towns and cities and the command of the militia; which the king refused to sanction (March 9, 1642). It was no longer a question of constitutional government, but whether Parliament or the king should rule absolutely. The Commons had the advantage, and proceeded upon a course in which they themselves performed every unconstitutional act which they had considered to be public offences when performed by the king in council. On Aug. 22, the king set up his standard at Nottingham and invited all who were for Church and Realm to rally round it. Thirty-two peers and sixty members of the House of Commons at once responded; and the remaining members set up a rival army, and passed laws without opposition, enforcing new taxes on people to pay expenses. The history of the Civil War will not be looked for in these pages, but it should not be forgotten that the struggle was quite as much on behalf of the ancient national religion against a novel puritanism as it was on behalf of absolute monarchy against parliamentary government. The civil and religious questions were not separated then. Not a single remonstrance or proposition was made by Parliament to the king unless the two questions were connected. The songs of the Cavaliers, as the partisans of Charles were called, invariably combined the causes. We give a specimen:—

'For the rights of fair England his broadsword he draws,
Her king is his leader, her Church is his cause,
His watchword is honour, his pay is renown,
God strike with the gallant that strikes for the Crown.'

And the Parliamentarians never essayed a battle without fortifying themselves with copious extracts from the Old Testament Scriptures as to the necessity of smiting the 'Philistines' hip and thigh, etc. Moreover they speedily entered into an alliance with the Scotch (Sept. 25, 1643) by which they bound themselves to carry out the Solemn League and Covenant to extirpate 'popery' and 'prelacy.' Here are some of its provisions:—

"That we shall sincerely really and constantly through the grace of God . . . endeavour to bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of Church government, directory for worship and catechising. (2) That we shall in like manner endeavour the extirpation of . . . Church government by archbishops, bishops . . . and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on their hierarchy. (3) We shall, with the same sincerity . . . endeavour . . . to preserve the rights and privileges of the parliaments and the liberties of the kingdoms; and to preserve and defend the king's majesty's person and authority . . . that the world may bear witness with our consciences of our loyalty."

In other words Parliament resolved to destroy the ancient Church of England and enforce conformity to Presbyterian methods, while their open war with the king is a sufficient comment upon their professions of loyalty. Henceforth there was a "life or death" struggle between Calvinism and the historic Church of the nation.

8. The Long Parliament and the Clergy.—We may fairly interrupt the chronological sequence at this stage to consider some of the troubles the clergy had to suffer at the hands of the Puritans. In December, 1640, the Long Parliament appointed a special committee to invite and deal with any complaints its friends might care to make against them, and to deprive all such incumbents as the committee should judge to be '*scandalous ministers*.' The committee were soon exceedingly busy with numerous complaints and the accused persons were summoned before it from all parts of the country, their parishes being deprived of their ministrations while they waited their turn to be examined. The prejudiced and partisan statements of the informers were accepted readily; but no rebutting evidence was allowed, or counter petitions and testimonials of character admitted. When we come to examine the charges made they appear to have consisted chiefly of offences against the Presbyterian idea of public worship; notwithstanding that they might have been in perfect accordance with the rubrics and canon law. There is a little church at Bemerton near Salisbury where for a short season the saintly priest *George Herbert* had ministered. He died just before Laud was elevated to the primacy, but he left behind some writings in prose and verse, which help us to form some idea of the high standard set up, and in many cases followed by the clergy in public and private. None who now read his

poems upon discipline and ecclesiastical symbolism would think that those who followed in his footsteps deserved reproof. For all who objected to uniform rules in religious matters he wrote :

Thou livest by rule! who doth not so but man?
Houses are built by rule, and commonwealths.
Entice the trusty sun, if that you can,
From his ecliptic line: beckon the sky!
Who lives by rule then, keeps good company.



GEORGE HERBERT'S CHURCH, BEMERTON.

and his idea of the middle position between Papal and Puritan extremes occupied by the National Church is thus expressed :—

She on the hills,¹ which wantonly
Allureth all in hope to be
By her preferred,
Hath kissed so long her painted shrines,
That e'en her face by kissing shines,
For her reward.

She in the valley² is so shy
Of dressing, that her hair doth lie
About her ears :
While she avoids her neighbour's pride
She wholly goes on th' other side,
And nothing wears.

But, dearest Mother³ (what those miss),
The mean thy praise and glory is,
And long may be!

The outward forms of worship had for him high spiritual lessons. Everything of which the sanctuary itself was composed—the very lock and key, the porch, the windows, the music, the monuments, even to the tessellated pavement of the church—all meant something.

‘Mark you the floor ? that square and speckled stone
Which looks so firm and strong,
Is Patience ;

And the other black and grave, wherewith each one
Is checkered all along,
Humility.

The gentle rising, which on either hand
Leads to the choir above,
Is Confidence.

But the sweet cement, which in one sure band
Ties the whole frame, is Love
And Charity.’

But it was just that reverence for symbolism, appealing to the heart through the outward senses, which the Puritan mind of the Long Parliament could not abide. Those who put a literal interpretation upon the precept of St. Paul that “at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow” were to them the greatest criminals, for whom no punishment was too excessive. There were however many members who declined to go to such outrageous lengths. *Sir Edward Dering*, *e.g.*, by no means a favourer of the Church until the violence of his colleagues drove him to sympathise with her, thus addressed the Speaker of the House when the draft instructions for the committee of enquiry respecting ‘scandalous’ ministers were discussed.

“And must I, Sir, hereafter do no exterior reverence—none at all—to God my Saviour, at the mention of his saving name Jesus? Why Sir, not to do it,—to omit it, and to leave it undone, it is questionable, it is controvertible; it is at least a moot point in divinity. But to deny it,—to forbid it to be done!—take heed, Sir, God will never own you if you forbid his honour. Truly, Sir, it horrors me to think of this. For my part, I do humbly ask pardon of this House, and thereupon I take leave and liberty to give you my resolute resolution. I may, I must, I will do bodily reverence unto my Saviour; and that upon occasion taken at the mention of his saving name Jesus. And if I should do it also as oft as the name of God, or Jehovah, or Christ, is named in our solemn devotions, I do not know any argument in divinity to control me In a word, certainly, Sir, I shall never obey your order so long as I have a head to lift up to Heaven—so long as I have an eye to lift up to Heaven! For these are corporal bowings, and my Saviour shall have them at his name JESUS!”

This was a privileged utterance in parliamentary debate; but many hundreds of clergy who endeavoured in like manner to carry out the rubrics and obey the canon law were expelled from their benefices as ‘*malignant*’ clergy, their places being filled by Puritan

preachers, many of whom were illiterate and unordained men. After the Parliament had accepted the Covenant all the clergy were called upon to sign it ; "such ministers as refused being reported to Parliament as malignants, and proceeded against accordingly. No fewer than seven thousand clergymen were upon this ground rejected from their livings ; so faithful were the great body of the clergy in the worst of times. The extent of private misery and ruin, which this occasioned, aggravated in no slight degree the calamities of civil war. It was not till some years had elapsed that a fifth part of the income was ordered to be paid to the wives and children of the sequestered ministers : and then the order had no retrospective effect ; in most instances it was disregarded, . . . and even had it been scrupulously paid, few were the cases wherein such a provision could have preserved the injured parties from utter want." (*Southey*.)

9. The Long Parliament and the Bishops.—One reason why no mercy was shown to the clergy was that they were but parts of a system that withstood the advance of Puritanism. They were members of an Episcopal Church, and Episcopacy was hateful to the majority of the Long Parliament ; although there were a few members in favour of it, and many who would have been satisfied with a limitation of its powers. So early as May 1, 1641, a bill passed the Commons to prohibit bishops from dealing with temporal matters ; the object being to exclude them from the House of Lords and Privy Council lest their opposition should prevent Puritan measures passing. But the House of Lords rejected the bill by a large majority. The Commons retorted by introducing the famous *Root and Branch Bill* for the entire abolition of Episcopacy and its dependent hierarchy as mentioned in the 'Et cetera' Oath. So drastic a measure could not be expected to pass without much opposition. It had been introduced by Sir E. Dering, but during the debate upon the second reading he said that he had done so without due consideration of its purport, and that he was convinced that bishops, if not of apostolical institution were yet of apostolical permission. "For of and in apostolical times, all stories, all fathers, all ages have agreed that such bishops there were." In consequence of the opposition the bill was abandoned until after many members had withdrawn from the house to follow their king. The Grand Remonstrance contained so many accusations against Episcopacy that after it was published a burst of popular indignation was raised against the order. Even

"The oyster-women lock'd their fish up,
And trudged away to cry 'No Bishop!'"

Armed mobs surrounded the House of Lords and so persistently threatened the prelates that they were fain to escape through byeways, and disguised for fear of their lives. The bishops then drew up and signed a protest against their ill-treatment ; wherein they

explained their ancient right to legislate as an estate of the realm, a body whose order had taken part in the government of the land centuries before the House of Commons existed, and declared all measures passed by the Peers in their absence would be illegal. When the Commons received the protest they at once impeached a number of the bishops for treason and sent them to the Tower (December, 1641). In their absence it was easy enough to pass a bill excluding them from the House of Lords (January, 1642); but it was not until the Royalists left the Parliament that the Commons ventured to reintroduce the 'Root and Branch' Bill. They did so, however, on September 1, 1642, in order to provide a basis for negotiations with the Scotch; who had refused to aid the Parliament against the king unless Presbyterianism was enforced upon the three kingdoms as the price of their assistance. It passed the House of Lords in 1643. None of these measures were legal statutes, because they did not receive the Royal Assent, nor was Parliament itself representative of the nation at the time, seeing that the Royalist minority was excluded from its deliberations. One of the demands in the Petition of Right (page 123) was that no person should be arrested and detained in prison without a speedy trial; but this was one of the first rights of the subject which the Long Parliament violated. Without trial it confined many bishops and large numbers of clergy in prison during its pleasure; and also without trial they had kept the head of the Anglican episcopate, Archbishop Laud, imprisoned in a dungeon of the Tower nearly four years.

" Prejudged by foes determined not to spare,
An old weak man for vengeance thrown aside."

Prynne, who had been cruelly punished by the Star Chamber Court, was very bitter against Laud, and was commissioned by the Commons to collect evidence against him. He seems to have been unsuccessful until he visited the primate in prison and compelled the poor man to surrender all his private papers and diaries; from which extracts were made in order to accuse him. As with Strafford the charges of treason failed, although the trial dragged its weary length along from November, 1643, to November, 1644. He had previously been ruined by the enormous fines imposed upon him as compensation to Prynne and others. He bore all his troubles with exemplary patience and defended himself throughout his long trial with remarkable vigour and courage. He was arraigned upon fifteen different charges of treason, with a view of proving him guilty of a conspiracy to overthrow the Constitution. When these failed to be substantiated they charged him with an attempt to introduce 'popery,' adducing in proof that he had received the offer of a cardinal's hat, that he had mended the stained-glass window of Lambeth Palace, and that he had Romish books and missals in his study. He was able to shew that he had refused the cardinalate at a time when there was neither honour

or profit in remaining true to the national religion, while wealth and ease awaited him if he would renounce it. "It is true, my lords," said he, "that I had many missals; but I had more of the Greek liturgies than the Roman, though I had as many of both as I could get. I would fain know how we should answer their errors if we may not have their books. I had liturgies, all I could get, both ancient and modern. I had also the Koran in divers copies; if this be an argument why do they not accuse me to be a Turk." His accusers then argued that if no one act of Laud's could be called high treason, yet in the aggregate they amounted to it. A Mr. Hearne, who was one of Laud's counsel, at once replied, "I cry you mercy Mr. Serjeant; I never understood before this time that two hundred couple of black rabbits would together make one black horse." When it was felt that the accusations might break down Parliament did the same as they had done with Strafford; they brought in a bill of Attainder, which passed the Commons on the 16th Nov.; but it was not until Jan. 4, 1645, that the Lords could be prevailed upon to give their assent. Six days later he was led out to Tower Hill for execution. After an earnest discourse to the assembled crowd, and a very impressive prayer which he had prepared for the occasion, he knelt beside the block and uttered these words: "Lord, I am coming as fast as I can; Lord receive my soul and have mercy upon me; and bless this land with Christian love and charity, for Jesus Christ's sake." Then with one blow of the axe his head was severed from its body. So perished an 'absolutely single-minded man, who could and did make great mistakes, but who never knowingly chose the lower part.' (*Wakeman.*)



AXE AND BLOCK.

10. The Westminster Assembly.—The real authors of this judicial murder were the godly and earnest divines nominated by the Parliament to advise it in religious affairs; a most intolerant assembly composed in part of members of the attenuated Parliament and in part of extreme puritan ministers from Scotland and England which met in the chapel of Henry VII. at Westminster. By its advice the Solemn League and Covenant was enforced upon all persons in the country above the age of eighteen. By its advice the public use of the Prayer-book was forbidden under penalties the very day that Laud was executed; and the *Directory* for Public Worship substituted for it. By this means it was made an offence to kneel at the reception of Holy Communion, or to use any kind of symbolism in sacred things, such as the ring in marriage; and when any person departed this life the dead body was to be interred without any kind of religious ceremony, nor were the

friends allowed to sing or read, or pray, or kneel, at the grave, although the civil pomp and pageantry in funeral processions of persons of rank or condition were not in any way restricted. Then the holy and beautiful petitions of our liturgy, though sanctified by the devotions of Christians in every clime and by every tongue for fifteen hundred years and more, gave place to long and tedious harangues, from illiterate fanatics, of two and three hours' duration; and the observance of great Church festivals, together with all anniversaries, was strictly forbidden. On Dec. 19, 1644, a solemn ordinance of Parliament was passed by the advice of the Westminster Assembly commanding that the hitherto joyous anniversary of our Lord's nativity should be observed as a day for national fasting and humiliation. To what lengths the Assembly would have gone had it been allowed free course it is impossible to say. An inordinately long formula in question and answer called the *Larger Catechism* was drawn up as a means of testing the orthodoxy of those who were supposed to be proficient in religion; and a *Shorter Catechism* was compiled, though much longer than that with which Churchmen are acquainted, for 'those of weaker capacity.' Owing to these efforts Presbyterianism was established as the national religion of England for a time. But only for a short time, because the Parliamentary army, which had been fighting against the Royalists with more or less of success, was by no means disposed to allow religious affairs to be settled without having a voice in the matter. Most of the original volunteers who composed the Parliamentary army were Presbyterians, as were the 21,000 men whom the Scotch brought over the border to help them in January, 1644. But a very large proportion of English Puritans were afterwards associated with them who objected to any uniform Church government; because they perceived that the little finger of the Westminster Assembly would be thicker than the loins of episcopacy had been; and would not be satisfied unless Parliament agreed to allow toleration for all religious bodies that were not governed by bishops. The longer the civil war lasted the stronger this party grew, much to the annoyance of the 'godly and learned divines' assembled at Westminster. These '*Independents*' of the army were under the leadership of a shrewd Huntingdonshire gentleman, *Oliver Cromwell*; and after his brilliant victory over Prince Rupert at the battle of Marston-Moor (July 2, 1644), his party took the lead. That there was no love lost between this rising party and the Presbyterians may be gathered from remarks of *Robert Baillie*, a Scotch divine, who recorded the proceedings of the Westminster Assembly, to which he belonged. The '*Independents*,' he writes, 'have the least zeal for the truth of God of any men we know.' And again, 'if we carry not the Independents with us there will be ground laid for a very troublesome schism.' Whereas *Oliver Cromwell* considered that all his Independent Ironsides were 'earnest and godly men,' whose hearts were in the cause of civil and religious liberty.

11. The 'Independent' Army.—Cromwell desired to abolish monarchy altogether, and when he found that Parliament offered to reinstate the king if Charles would agree to the establishment of Presbyterianism (Jan. 30, 1645) he determined to carry his design into action. As the Presbyterian generals had failed to follow up advantages gained in battles, he impeached them as traitors to the cause. Under cover of a *Self-denying Ordinance*, which passed the Houses in April, 1645, and forbade members of Parliament to hold commands in the army, the Presbyterian generals were allowed to give up their commissions. Cromwell was himself a member, but he obtained exemption from the ordinance and remodelled the army; his friend Sir T. Fairfax being nominated General. At the *Battle of Naseby* (June 14) the Royalists were utterly routed; after which the 'New Model' army had very little difficulty in capturing and occupying the fortresses that had been held in the king's name. The king



A PURITAN SOLDIER.

soon afterwards surrendered himself to the Scottish army at Newark (May 5, 1646) in the hope of retrieving his fortunes by making terms with the Presbyterians. But on receipt of encouragement from the queen, who was then in France raising money and friends, he refused the terms which Parliament offered.¹ The Scotch then surrendered him to the English Parliament in return for an indemnity of £400,000 (Jan. 30, 1647) and he was lodged at Holmby House, Northamptonshire. Thinking that the war was practically over Parliament endeavoured to checkmate Cromwell by reinforcing the Self-denying Ordinance so as to deprive

him of his command; and passing other ordinances to reduce the army, deprive the soldiers of five-sixths of their arrears of pay, and compel all officers to sign the Presbyterian covenant. Cromwell retorted by calling the army together near Newmarket (June 4, 1647), having previously removed the king from Holmby House by force, and demanding the expulsion from Parliament of eleven leaders of the Presbyterian party who had suggested the obnoxious ordinances. They then lodged the king at Hampton Court and made liberal proposals to him; on condition, among other things, that there should be complete toleration for all religions

¹ Parliament had demanded (1) That Presbyterianism should continue to be the established religion; (2) That the militia officers should be appointed by the Parliament; (3) That war should be carried on against the Irish who had massacred the Puritans of Ulster after Strafford's recall.

except that of the Romanists. Those might be governed by bishops who chose, but the old National Church was not to be restored. Charles I. refused these terms and managed to escape from his guards. He took refuge at Carisbrook Castle in the Isle of Wight, in the expectation that the governor would prove loyal; but the latter was in the pay of his enemies, so that the king continued to be a prisoner. Still it was neutral ground for a time, from which he was able to renew his negotiations

with friends in Scotland and France. All along Charles endeavoured to keep the Presbyterians and Independents at feud, in the hope that one or the other would be glad for the sake of peace to restore him to his old position. Many moderate Presbyterians now joined the Royalists against the Independents; and many Scotchmen who were averse to a republic under Cromwell crossed the border to fight in the king's behalf. But the Ironsides were



CARISBROOK CASTLE, ISLE OF WIGHT.

irresistible, and by August, 1648, they had entirely discomfited the Royalist allies; and driven Charles I. to the verge of despair.

12. Regicide.—In the flush of victory the Independent army marched to London and demanded 'justice on the king' whom they considered the cause of the revived hostilities and consequent loss of life. But the Presbyterian members were by no means disposed to kill their lawful sovereign. In fact they had at last come to an agreement with Charles, who had despairingly acquiesced in their demands; which included the suspension of episcopacy for three years, and a provisional retention of Presbyterianism in the meantime. Cromwell then decided on a *coup d'état*. He sent Colonel Pride to the House of Commons with a band of Ironsides, to prevent the entrance of the Presbyterian members who formed a majority in the House. Only about fifty-three sworn friends of the army were allowed admittance, and they immediately passed a bill to try the king before a special court of their own appointment. There were only twelve members of the House of Lords left, but they at once rejected

the measure ; whereupon the fifty-three Independents resolved that anything which they might decide upon should have the binding force of law without the consent of the king or House of Lords. The army might as well have examined and killed the king by martial law as to have made its name infamous by this enforced parody of constitutional procedure. No time was lost. Colonel Pride had turned the Presbyterian members out on December 6, 1648 ; and before the end of the month a ' high court of justice ' was nominated. One hundred and thirty-five persons were named as members of the court ; but only sixty-seven appeared in answer to their names. Sir Thos. Fairfax was one of the absentees ; but his wife was present when the roll was called (Jan. 20, 1649) and indignantly cried out, " He is not here, and will never be ; you do wrong to name him." The chairman of the court was a lawyer named Bradshaw. Charles was arraigned on charges of treason, tyranny, and murder. He refused to plead to the indictment on the ground that the court was not competent to try him. The mock trial occupied seven days. Thirty-two witnesses were examined and he was condemned to be beheaded. The warrant for his execution, signed by fifty-nine members of the court led by Bradshaw, Grey, and Oliver Cromwell, is still preserved in the House of Lords. Charles was justly accused of insincerity and double dealing ; but Churchmen ought not to forget that almost up to the last he might have saved his life, and regained some measure of his former dignity and influence, if he would have consented to the abolition of the ancient Church of England. He never would consent to place the National Church on a level with sectarianism. He said :—" I am firm to Primitive Episcopacy, not to have it extirpated if I can hinder it." With reference to the appeals of the Puritans, he writes, ' I have done what I could to bring my conscience to a compliance with their proposals, and cannot ; and I will not lose my conscience to save my life.'¹ He bore his sentence calmly, and spent his remaining hours devotionally in the company of *William Juxon*, Bishop of London. On the 30 Jan., 1649, he was put to death. He had been taking a tender farewell of his two children—Princess Elizabeth, aged thirteen, and Prince Henry, aged eight (his elder children were with the Queen in France)—when Bishop Juxon came to say " Sire, there is but one stage more, a troublesome but a short one." On stepping forth from the window of Whitehall Palace on to the scaffold prepared for the last scene in his earthly life, he addressed a few words to the multitude that had assembled ; explaining that the guilt of the civil war did not rest with him, since Parliament had been the first to take up arms ; but he confessed that he deserved to die for having consented to the death of *Strafford*. As he knelt down and laid his head upon the block he

1 From *Eikōn Basilikē*, a contemporary biography of Charles I. ; said by some to have been written by the king himself, and by others to have been the work of his friend Bishop Gauden. Parts of it are certainly in the handwriting of Charles.



CHARLES I. PARTING WITH HIS CHILDREN.

exclaimed "I go from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown." They buried him in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, but the burial service of the Church of England was not allowed to be read over his remains. The judicial execution of a king was never heard of before, and the majority of his subjects felt that he had been illegally condemned and that the Constitution was at the mercy of the army. Until recently a service of humiliation was appended to the Book of Common Prayer, for use on the anniversary of his death, which spoke of him as 'King Charles the Martyr.' It was removed in 1859.

CHAPTER XXIII. (A.D. 1649-1660).

UNDER THE COMMONWEALTH.

"O, terrible excess

Of headstrong will! Can this be piety?

No—some fierce maniac hath usurped her name;

And scourges England struggling to be free."—*Wordsworth.*

1. **Proceedings of the 'Rump.'**—Few will wonder at the determination of modern Englishmen to support the Church of England in her legal privileges, on the ground that the welfare of the Constitution is bound up in her prosperity, when they remember the sequence of memorable events for which the Long Parliament was responsible; especially as it is the only occasion in history when there was a majority of members in the House of Commons pledged to uproot the National Church. First the ancient government of the Church was overthrown, the bishops being imprisoned, exiled, or murdered. Next the ancient service books were proscribed and supplanted by the Westminster formularies; while all petitions on behalf of the Church were voted seditious, and the signatories criminally proceeded against. Then the most ancient *civil* government—the honoured kingdom of England, with its council of spiritual and temporal peers—was suppressed; and a military despotism set up in its place, which soon overwhelmed the more modern legislative body also. Two days after the funeral of the 'martyred' king the '*Rump*' (as the remnant of the Long Parliament became contemptuously called) proceeded to confirm Col. Pride's expulsion of the Presbyterian members. On Feb. 6 it declared the House of Lords abolished, and the following day prohibited the government of England by a king or single person. On the 19th of May it surpassed all previous efforts by declaring the country to be *A Commonwealth*. Strictly speaking, everything that they did was flagrantly illegal, save the legality of having might on their side. It also issued a declaration on religion, and compelled all ministers to take a new

oath, called *The Engagement*, annulling the Covenanters' Oath, by which they bound themselves "to be true and faithful to the Commonwealth without a king or house of peers." But there was still life in the monarchy. There is a proverb belonging to all kingdoms :—" *Le Roi est mort, Vive le Roi*"—and the eldest surviving son of the late king, who had escaped with his mother to the Continent, at once assumed the style of Charles II. ; and prepared to claim his right.


2. Religious Anarchy.—All ecclesiastical discipline was overthrown during the civil war. Half the clergy had been expelled by the committees that dealt with 'scandalous and malignant ministers;' many of the remaining half were driven out for declining to accept the Covenant; a still further reduction ensuing from refusals to take the 'engagement' oath. 'Swarms of all sorts of illiterate mechanic preachers, yea, of women and boy preachers' occupied their places; thus facilitating the dissemination of lawless opinions. Frequently Puritan soldiers would turn the preachers out of the pulpits at service time and occupy their places. Those who felt inclined to propagate their personal opinions found it easy to do so in the name of religion. Had not Oliver Cromwell vigorously suppressed fanatics the country would have been ruined utterly. Some mutinous soldiers, called *Levellers*, who desired to obliterate all distinctions of rank or wealth and abolish ministers of every kind, had to be promptly executed. The more earnest royalists and faithful clergy fled to France; and when it chanced that any were able to get passports to return and set their temporal affairs in order, they found 'the pulpits full of novices and novelties.'

"Going this day (Dec. 4, 1653) to our Church I was surprised to see a tradesman, a mechanic, step up. I was resolv'd yet to stay and see what he would make of it. His text was from *2 Sam. ch. 23, v. 20*. 'And Benaiah went down also and slew a lion in the midst of a pit in the time of snow;' the purport was, that no danger was to be thought difficult when God called for shedding of blood, inferring that now 'the Saints' were called to destroy temporal governments."—*Evelyn's Diary*.

So rapidly did every wild and lawless opinion find adherents, that the new Government was compelled to impose tests of orthodoxy, and take upon itself the censorship of public morals. For this state of things the party then in power had only themselves to blame. "With extreme license the common people, almost from the very beginning of the Parliament, took upon themselves the reforming without authority, order, or decency; rudely disturbing Church service while the Common Prayer was reading, tearing the books, surplices, and such things."¹ They considered that the Parliamentary order to destroy all 'monuments of idolatry' gave them liberty and license for every kind of sacrilege; so that it became a common

¹ May's History of the Long Parliament.

pastime to break the painted windows and deface the statuary which adorned and beautified the churches. The old market crosses which had been a notable feature of English towns, reminding the passers by of the great Act of Redemption, were all ruthlessly destroyed. In speaking of the diseases of his age, Bishop Andrews declared that there had been "a good riddance of images; yet for *imaginings*, they be daily stamped in great number, and, instead of the old images, set up, deified, and worshipped." In the year 1647 all stage plays were prohibited as dangerous to morals, the theatres closed, and the actors publicly whipped. This can be understood and defended; for the words and topics of the dramas then presented were, to say the least, suggestive of immorality; but it seems to modern ideas that the Long Parliament carried its censorship too far when the country folk were punished for wrestling on the village greens, or dancing round the maypoles.



DESTRUCTION OF CHEAPSIDE CROSS.

3. The Quakers.—A grim commentary on the Puritan demands for religious liberty is furnished by the stern repressive measures enforced against Unitarians, Anabaptists, and Quakers; who shared with Romanists and English Churchmen the enmity of the Commonwealth. *Quakers* came into notice about 1650. Their early practices differed strongly from the inoffensive character of the modern Society of Friends. A contemporary writer describes them as 'a new sect

who shew no respect to any man, magistrate, or other, and seem a melancholy proud sort of people and exceedingly ignorant.' Their leaders were *George Fox* and *James Naylor*. The latter was a half-mad fanatic, whose misdirected zeal brought discredit on the whole community. Some of his immediate followers came to be regarded as public pests. One is said to have stood at the door of the Parliament House with a drawn sword, and declared that the Holy Ghost had moved him to slay all members who should attempt to enter. Others used to rush about the streets in a state of nudity and wildly condemn the evils of the time. It was quite a customary practice for them to carry on their trades all through Sundays, and disturb other congregations by denouncing the preachers as 'false prophets' and 'lying witnesses.' Naylor was at last arrested, whipped, branded, and bored through the tongue, while the prisons were filled with the zealots who half worshipped him. 'It is due to the memory of George Fox to say that he repudiated the fanatical proceedings of his friends, but even he, good man that he was, several times suffered imprisonment for contempt of court and refusal to pay tithes. A better known leader of this sect was Wm. Penn, the founder of the State of Pennsylvania; but neither he nor Fox would ever doff their hats in presence of magistrates or majesty. The tenets of the Quakers which have survived in those of the Society of Friends are hatred of war, objection to oaths, the non-necessity of sacraments or ministerial orders, and the individual guidance of the Holy Spirit. They have always been noted for their personal piety.

4. Worcester Fight.—Irishmen and Scotchmen acknowledged Charles II. for their hereditary monarch as soon as it was known that his father had been beheaded. The Irish were the first to ask the exiled prince to come to their aid against Cromwell's military despotism; but before he could reach them the 'man of the sword' had captured the royalist stronghold of Drogheda and massacred all the able-bodied men in cold blood. Charles II. then made his way to Scotland (1650) and agreed to the Covenant for that kingdom. The Scots rallied round his standard in vain, for Cromwell again tasted the sweets of victory at Dunbar and at Leith. On the first of January, 1651, Charles was crowned at Scone, and set up his camp at Stirling. While Cromwell was engaged at Perth he made a strategic movement and invaded England with 11,000 Scotch soldiers, arriving at Worcester August 23. Cromwell followed him five days later, and there was a great battle fought on both sides of the town at once, Sept. 3, 1651. This was not merely a civil war, it was distinctly a religious one so far as the soldiers were concerned; for while the Scotch adopted "The Covenant" for their battle cry, Cromwell's Ironsides shouted "The Lord of Hosts;" and when the day was decided in Cromwell's favour, and the streets of Worcester were deluged with the blood of the royalists, whom the victors slew

1 3173 Quakers were imprisoned by the Puritans. 32 of them died in Prison.

without pity, the grim leader declared that it was 'Heaven's crowning mercy' on his cause. That fatal day put an end to the hopes of Charles II. for a time. But he escaped from the scene of carnage and baffled all attempts of the Cromwellians to find him, chiefly through the assistance of a lady who disguised him as her serving man. After many romantic adventures, which proved how many staunchly loyal folk there were all over the south and west of England, the king managed to reach Shorcham, whence he crossed to France in a coal ship, October 1651, although not without his share

'Of moving accidents by flood and field.'

To prevent any further risings in the Stuart cause Cromwell kept standing armies in Ireland and in Scotland. His son-in-law, *Ireton*, commanded the Irish garrison, and *General Monk* the Scotch division.

5. Destruction of Churches.¹—The greatest cause of lasting grief, which has made the great rebellion infamous, was the wanton destruction of the cathedrals and churches by the soldiery. Wherever the rival armies went the sacred edifices were used as barracks, stables, hospitals, and fortresses. That was to be expected; but much worse sacrilege has been recorded. Allowances might be made for the heated passions of the victorious Puritans after such a fight as Worcester, and if the destruction had been confined to such occasions no notice would have been taken of it in these pages. But destruction was everywhere, and deliberate; and accompanied by the most derisive profanation. Soon after the Civil War had been commenced parliamentary troops occupied the city of *Hereford*. On the first Sunday of their residence they went to the cathedral and showed their contempt and scorn of our Church's services by dancing on the tessellated pavement of the edifice as soon as the organ began to play. In 1645 the Puritan army again besieged that city and did much material damage to the cathedral fabric. Dean Croft preached to the soldiers against the sin of sacrilege and very nearly lost his life for his pains. They destroyed the windows, tore up the brasses, and carried off the ornaments. As in other dioceses the episcopal estates were sequestered, and the revenues bestowed upon the Parliament men; Puritan preachers taking the place of the clergy. The history of every diocese tells the same sad tale of the cold-blooded demolition of every artistic detail in the churches, and the irreverent and coarse jests of the military. It was a well-known intention of the Long Parliament that this kind of thing should be winked at, and therefore, whenever the curators of a beautiful church heard that the Puritan soldiers were coming they would themselves remove and hide the choicest carvings and statuary with a view to their restoration in quieter times. At Winchester the soldiers broke open the west door of the

¹ The quotations in this section are from the S.P.C.K. Diocesan Histories.

cathedral while the morning service was going on, and marched up the nave with colours flying and drums beating. The tombs were rifled, and the bones of the dead used as missiles to break the windows that were too high for the halberds to reach. The altar was removed to an alehouse and burnt along with the service books. The soldiers arrayed themselves in the surplices of the choir, and marched in mock procession through the city with banners, crosses, and pictures; tooting upon the pipes which they had torn from the organ. Similar scenes were witnessed in the city of Norwich. At Chichester the soldiers ran 'up and down the church with their swords drawn, defacing the monuments, hacking and hewing the seats and stalls, scratching and scraping the painted walls, Sir W. Waller and the rest of the commanders standing by as spectators of these impious barbarities; . . . the chalice was broken into bits for division of the spoil, and the Bible marked in divers places with a black coal.' At St. Asaph, the cathedral was used as a stable for the horses of one Miller, a postmaster, who occupied the bishop's palace as an inn, fed his calves in the bishop's throne, and removed the font into his yard for use as a watering trough.' Exeter



HEREFORD CATHEDRAL.

Cathedral and Wells Cathedral were each divided in two parts by a brick wall for the express purpose of being used for different denominations, the Independents in one part and the Presbyterians in the other. At Lichfield Cathedral the fanaticism of the Puritan soldiers found outlets in the most derisive profanation. To hunt a cat with hounds within its walls was a daily sport ; and they shewed their contempt of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism by dressing up a calf in infant's clothes, and sprinkling it at the font. "On Feb. 18, 1653, it was ordered that all the cathedral churches in England, where there are other churches sufficient for the people to meet in for



PONTEFRAC T OLD CHURCH.

the worship of God, should be surveyed, pulled down, and the materials sold ;' and in the following July a committee was appointed to 'consider what cathedrals should stand or what part thereof.' But the parliamentary changes together with the petitions of residents, prevented the execution of this last design. The despoilers were fain to content themselves with seizure of the church plate and stripping the lead from the roofs which was used to furnish in part the sinews for Cromwell's war with the Dutch. The same destruc-

tion and spoliation fell upon the grand old parish churches everywhere, although, as with the cathedrals, the injuries have been repaired in recent times. Lambeth Palace was made over to a couple of the regicides, one of whom divided the chapel into two parts; using one portion for a dining hall and the other as a recreation room. The tomb of Archbishop Parker was broken open and removed, his bones being scattered about. Truly has it been said that those were times of public ruin and confusion. *Pontefract Church* is still in the ruinous condition that the Puritans left it. The parishioners still tell their children the story of how, upon the neighbouring castle hill, the soldiers planted their cannons; and then bombarded the church. There has not been enough enthusiasm in Pontefract to wipe out the stain by restoring its former glory, and the people are still compelled to worship in the patched up transepts. If something is not speedily done it will be past restoration. Not without reason did Church folk under the Commonwealth feel themselves in the position of the captive Jews, and cry:—"O God! the heathen are come into Thine inheritance: Thy holy temple have they defiled, and made Jerusalem an heap of stones."

6. Cromwell's Parliaments.—The 'Rump,' as the remnant of the Long Parliament was called, soon became objectionable to Cromwell. It wanted more power in the direction of affairs than he was disposed to tolerate. Their relations came to a climax over the *Perpetuation Bill*, by which the Parliament was to be increased to 400 members; but the members of the 'Rump' were to continue sitting without re-election, and become a committee with power to reject any new members that should be elected whom they thought dangerous to the Commonwealth! The Act of 1641, by which Parliament was not to be dissolved without its own consent, was very precious to the 'Rump'; but Cromwell found a way of effecting his purpose in spite thereof. On April 20, 1653, he went down to the house accompanied by 300 trusty soldiers. These he left outside while he went in to harangue the 53 members who were discussing the Bill referred to. He soon began to abuse the members, and when they objected to his unparliamentary language he shouted "I'll put an end to your prating. You are no parliament. Get you gone! Give way to honest men. It is not fit you should sit here any longer." At a given signal the musketeers rushed in and cleared out the astonished members. "What shall we do with this bauble?" cried the general as he lifted the mace. "Take it away." As the members reluctantly dispersed Cromwell heaped upon them words of obloquy. "You have forced me to do this—I have sought the Lord day and night that he would slay me rather than put me upon the doing of this work." Cromwell's religious 'voices' ever mingled themselves with his destructive wrath. When all the members had departed the door was locked, and the key carried away by one of the general's colonels

and no more was heard of the 'Rump' for a season. Henceforth Cromwell was supreme, with or without the will of the people. 'No Bishops'—'no King'—and then 'no Parliament.' A memorable sequence! And every effort was made to prevent them from being restored. The nation was not allowed to express an opinion upon these changes. Everything was done by the vote of the army and the vigour of Oliver Cromwell. He now called together a parliament of his own nominees, not in any sense a representative body, but men chosen for their devotion to the cause Cromwell represented; men who belonged to 'the Lord's people.' But his 'godly' nominees turned out a most refractory set, without practical knowledge of men and laws, with few or no ideas beyond the repression of 'popery and prelacy.' They are known as the '*Barebones Parliament*,' from the peculiar name (Praise-God-Barebones) of one of its members; a leather-seller in the city of London. It met July 4, 1653, and very soon set to work upon religious questions. A proposal to confiscate all ecclesiastical revenues, in order to pay the stipends of itinerant preachers of their own appointment, was only lost by two votes. It also proposed to abolish the old system of ecclesiastical patronage, the payment of tithes, and religious services at weddings; but could not agree as to details. At the end of five months this contemptible assembly, which was the jest of the people, resigned its power to the man who had bestowed it, and passed into an unregretted oblivion. Cromwell then held a council of officers, and although the decree of Feb. 7, 1649, had never been repealed, they resolved to have a Commonwealth *in a single person*, viz.—HIMSELF, who should bear the title of 'Lord Protector.' A written constitution called the *Instrument of Government* was drawn up; by which he bound himself (among other things) to extend religious liberty to all who differed from the doctrine, worship and discipline of Independency, *provided that this liberty be not extended to popery or prelacy*, nor to such as under the profession of Christ hold forth and practice licentiousness. By the 'Instrument' Cromwell was bound also to call a parliament together, which should meet once a year. The first protectorate Parliament met on September 3, 1654. In the meantime Cromwell had issued a number of ordinances, such as the appointment of the Commissions to examine the clergy (page 156). Some of the members of the new Parliament objected to the 'Instrument', and especially to government by a single person; and Cromwell expelled about a hundred of them from the House, on the ground that they had been elected under the conditions of the Instrument and were bound to accede to its provisions (September 12). But even the members who agreed to sign the Instrument were continually trying to limit Cromwell's power, so he determined to dissolve that Parliament also; which was done January 22, 1655. Henceforth Cromwell assumed supreme control of the helm of state, and governed the country in a far more arbitrary and autocratic

manner than any previous king had done. And because the Church of England was synonymous to his mind with Charles Stuart he took care that it should be rent and crippled in every way; although here and there a few private houses of influential laymen were allowed to be used as secret meeting places for Churchmen, under a show of toleration. A royalist rising in the west of England furnished a pretext for fresh oppression. The necessity of levying fresh taxes to pay for his expensive foreign wars demanded that another Parliament should be called. The elected members met September 17, 1656; and



OLIVER CROMWELL EXPELLING THE 'RUMP.'

Cromwell felt it needful to begin the session with an excuse for his intolerance to the Cavalier interest (*i.e.*, the Church), on the ground that it was 'the badge and character countenancing of profaneness, disorder, and wickedness in all places; and whatsoever is most akin to these and what is popery; and with the profane nobility of this nation!' From this second Parliament of his protectorate Oliver excluded all those who were not ready to support his ideals of civil and religious government, and the trusty remnant offered him the title of 'king' (March 29, 1657). But the army strongly objected, and after several ineffectual conferences with the officers the coveted 'feather in his cap' was declined. But he accepted the '*Humble Petition and Advice*' which gave him authority to nominate his successor, and create a new peerage, so that he was king in all but the name; those who refused to take the oath to him being deprived of all their offices. In the parliamentary recess Cromwell made

religious government, and the trusty remnant offered him the title of 'king' (March 29, 1657). But the army strongly objected, and after several ineffectual conferences with the officers the coveted 'feather in his cap' was declined. But he accepted the '*Humble Petition and Advice*' which gave him authority to nominate his successor, and create a new peerage, so that he was king in all but the name; those who refused to take the oath to him being deprived of all their offices. In the parliamentary recess Cromwell made

peers of his most devoted followers, and invited some of the old 'profane nobility' to join them. The latter contemptuously declined. When Parliament resumed its sessions—Protector, Lords, and Commons—January 20, 1658, the previously excluded members were allowed to take their seats in the House of Commons. As the warmest supporters of Cromwell had been removed to the 'upper house,' these formed the majority of members, and at once proceeded to repudiate all that had been done in the Autumn session of 1657. Boiling over with indignation Cromwell dissolved this Parliament also within a fortnight of its meeting, and did not live to call another. This needful review of Cromwell and his legislative assemblies shows that he was guilty of every indiscretion which had been considered a crime in Charles I. The 'Petition of Right' was broken every day. Taxes were levied and men imprisoned against the will of Parliament, and without cause shown; and men were detained months and years in prison without even being brought to trial, simply because they objected to the rule of an uncrowned despot.

7. Sufferings of the Clergy.—We have already seen that some thousands of the lawful incumbents had been ejected from their benefices because they were loyal to the Church, and their places filled by unordained persons; but that did not satisfy Cromwell. Under the powers of the 'Instrument' he issued an ordinance (March 20, 1654) appointing a '*Committee of Triers*' whose business was to enquire into the character and principles of all persons who were nominated to their benefices by the ancient system of patronage, and to appoint others in the room of such as should be rejected; because 'for some time past no certain course had been established for the supplying vacant places with able and fit persons, whereby many weak, scandalous, popish, and ill-affected persons had intruded themselves.' The test of ability and fitness was explained by a subsequent ordinance (Sept 2) to mean "experience of their conformity and submission to the present government." But the 'Triers' could only deal with *future* appointments, and there were still many loyal clergy who had not been removed by the various processes detailed in the last chapter. These were to be got rid of by sub-committees for ejecting 'scandalous' ministers, appointed by virtue of another ordinance (Aug. 30), whose duties were to inquire minutely into the character and politics of clergy already possessed of benefices. These sub-committees created vacancies in every county which the Triers proceeded to fill. The unfortunate ejected incumbents then endeavoured to obtain a bare subsistence for themselves and their families by educating other peoples' children, and acting as chaplains in well-to-do royalist families. But Cromwell had no mind to let them earn an honest livelihood. On the 27th of November, 1655, he issued an edict which, for severity and intolerance, would be difficult to match:—

"His Highness, by the advice of his Council doth publish, declare, and order:— That no person or persons do, from and after the first day of January (1656) keep in their houses or families as chaplains, or schoolmasters for the education of their children, any sequestered or ejected minister, fellow of a college, or schoolmaster; nor permit any of their children to be taught by such; in pain of being proceeded against in such sort as the said orders do direct in such cases. And that no person who hath been sequestered or ejected out of any benefice, college, or school, for delinquency or scandal, shall, from and after the said first day of January, keep any school either public or private; nor shall any person, who after that time shall be ejected for the causes aforesaid, preach in any public place, or at any private meeting of other persons besides his own family; nor administer baptism or the Lord's Supper, or marry any persons, or use the book of Common Prayer, or the forms therein contained; upon pain that every person so offending shall be proceeded against as by the said orders is provided."

This is the way the Lord Protector acted, whom some modern writers are anxious to belaud as a model of Christian tolerance. The penalty for offending against his ordinances was imprisonment and banishment. The jails were immediately filled to overflowing, and for want of room the 'malignant' clergy were imprisoned in palace fortresses and in the dismantled hulks of worn out ships. The Water Tower of Lambeth Palace (see page 7) had been used as a prison ever since 1645; but we need not multiply examples of the ill-treatment meted out to the clergy who were there incarcerated. Dr. Edmund Pocock, a world renowned Oriental scholar, was charged before the Berkshire sub-committee for having used parts of the



DR. JEREMY TAYLOR.

Prayer-book in public worship. He was condemned for *insufficiency*. The rejection of the most learned man of his day on such a ground was too ridiculous even for the Nonconformists; and on the intercession of Dr. Owen, a famous Puritan minister, Cromwell overruled the decision. Dr. *Jeremy Taylor*, 'the Shakespeare of Divines,' was rector of Uppingham until the Civil War; when he attended the king in camp as chaplain. He was taken captive and imprisoned in Chepstow Castle. There he wrote a famous book pleading for religious toleration, called *Liberty of Prophesying*. On being released he became chaplain to the Earl of Carbery and wrote his '*Holy Living*,' '*Holy Dying*,'

and the '*Golden Grove*' which have been of untold value to number.

less Christians in spiritual need. He was imprisoned again under the powers of the edict of 1655, because he had preached to a small congregation of faithful Churchmen who met for secret worship in London. Records were kept of the sufferings of the clergy during the Rebellion and the Commonwealth that are simply appalling in their horror. We take two extracts at random, from Hutching's History of Dorset, as examples of the prevalent bitterness.

"THOMAS CLARK, Rector of Haslebury Brian, a man of unblemished reputation, was dispossessed and plundered. His son, a clergyman, was shot to death on the road. He died during the Commonwealth. The intruder, James Rawson, claimed the living at the Restoration, but the Commissioners disallowed the claim because he had publicly prayed for the extermination of the royal family, and libelled the queen in a sermon."

"ROGER CLARK, Rector of Ashmore, near Shaftesbury, was plundered of all that he had, and twice imprisoned. Two of his children (twins) were stripped naked and laid in a dripping pan before the fire to be roasted; their mother being almost denuded of clothing."

These are not isolated or exceptional cases. The modern friends of the Puritans disclaim on the part of the authorities any responsibility for these cruelties; but it is certain that the army ruled the land, and that the officers seldom punished excesses of their men. Here and there dangers were braved and services conducted on Prayer-book lines, the petitions being committed to memory so as to keep within the letter of the Directory; and sometimes episcopally ordained men obtained posts as Lecturers; but most of the clergy fled from the country, or hid themselves, or were in prison. A contemporary layman wrote in his diary against March 1658: "There was now a collection for persecuted and sequestered ministers of the Church of England, whereof divers are in prison. A sad day! The Church now in dens and caves of the earth." One of the clergy reduced to this condition, *William Bartlett*, wrote from prison:

"I have been Vicar of Yetminster 39 years, time enough to know me inside and outside; but notwithstanding that, all my possessions are taken from me which were my father's patrimony, whereunto God hath called me, and wherein I was settled by the laws of the kingdom. But, howsoever, I am an undone man, and how to recover myself I know not, for want of means."

8. Sufferings of the Laity.—The edict of November 1655 attacked more than the clergy. The faithful laity also, known for their loyalty to Church and Realm, were made to feel the oppression. And that not merely by the loss of their spiritual advisers, but by a very considerable seizure of their property. One-tenth was demanded of all the royalists' revenues throughout England. The land had been put under a number of major-generals, who enforced the payment; and all meetings, social as well as public ones, at

which the Protector's proceedings might be discussed, were disallowed. This was stated to be because some West of England gentry had conspired to overthrow his rule. "It was made a crime for a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians." (Macaulay.) "An ever-abiding sense of wrong stirred up the indignation of men who had looked back with regret to the Church observances which had been familiar to them in youth. Extempore prayer offered abundant facilities for the display of folly and profanity as well as of piety, and there were thousands who contrasted the tone and language of the new ministers with the measured devotion of the Book of Common Prayer, altogether to the advantage of the latter. Church and king, the old religious forms and the old political institutions, came to be inextricably fused together in their minds; mingled with a vague and inarticulate sense of wrong being done to England by the openly avowed attempt to drive her by force when argument made no impression' (*Gardiner*). *John Evelyn*, a gentleman of position and refinement, kept a diary of the time which tells a sad tale of the ill-treatment put upon the Church party. Against Dec. 25, 1653 (being also a Sunday), he wrote:—'No churches or public assembly. I was fain to pass the devotions of that blessed day with my family at home.' In Sept., 1655, he wrote:—'On Sunday afternoon I frequently stayed at home to catechise and instruct my family; those exercises universally ceasing in the parish churches, so as



JOHN EVELYN.

people had no principles, and grew very ignorant of even the common points of Christianity; all devotion being now placed in hearing sermons and discourses of speculative and notional things.' After the edict, against Dec. 25, 1655, he wrote:—'There was no more notice taken of Christmas day in churches. I went to London when Dr. Wild preached the funeral sermon of preaching, this being the last day, after which Cromwell's Proclamation was to take place, that none of the Church of England should dare either to preach or administer Sacraments, teach schools, &c., on pain of imprisonment or exile. So this was the mournfullest day that in my life I had seen. . . . The Lord Jesus pity our distressed Church, and bring back the captivity

of Zion.' The same writer, against August 3, in the next year testifies :—'The parish churches were filled with sectaries of all sorts, blasphemous and ignorant mechanics usurping the pulpits everywhere;' and when on Christmas Day, in 1657, Evelyn and others ventured to attend a celebration, the chapel was surrounded by soldiers, who levelled their muskets at the communicants, '*as if they would have shot us at the altar,*' and afterwards took the whole congregation prisoners. "All that the State *could* do to crush the life out of the Church was done, but that all was really nothing. Never was her life more vigorous than when she was spoken and thought of as dead and buried, never was her liturgy more venerated than when it was proscribed, never were her faithful ministers more firmly attached to her principles than when the profession of those principles entailed the ruin of every worldly prospect."¹ All looked forward hopefully to better times, and with good reason; for friends were to be found, even in the domestic circle of the Lord Protector.

9. Royalist Reaction.—Anything that has been written in the foregoing pages is not intended to throw doubt upon Oliver Cromwell's personal piety or genius. No man has been more execrated, and in late years efforts have been made to set him forth as a saint. Neither plan is necessary or accurate. His military prowess and statesmanship which regained for England the prominence among European nations forfeited by James I., and established social tranquility after the civil wars, is acknowledged by all; but these pages have to deal with home ecclesiastical affairs, in which he does not shine with undimmed lustre. He died Sept. 3, 1658, and his last hours were spent in prayer. His son Richard succeeded him in the protectorate; but the army, ruled by Oliver with such success, despised the new comer, and recalled the 'Rump' of the long Parliament which his father had arbitrarily expelled. This at once restored the Covenanters' oath in place of the 'Engagement.' No relief came to the Church by that change. We read in Evelyn's diary against May 19, 1659, 'The nation was now in extreme confusion and unsettled, between the armies and the sectaries, the poor Church of England breathing as it were her last, so sad a face of things overspread us.' The 'Rump' soon quarrelled with the army, and was again expelled; this time by General Lambert, who had been deprived of his command for refusing to take the oath of allegiance to Cromwell, but who was now accepted by the army in London as its leader. But the nation was weary of being governed by fanatical sectaries who brought nothing but anarchy in their train. All longed for an orderly and settled government, and when Evelyn published his bold apology for the king it received general approbation. But it was General Monk, who had for a long time governed Scotland as Cromwell's second, that

¹ Canon Overton's *Life in the English Church*, 1660—1714. Longmans 14s,

succeeded in leading the nation to the desired goal without bloodshed. He was a taciturn man, and an accomplished dissembler; and as he proceeded to London he could see that all men were ready to accept his decision though they hoped he would declare for 'the king.' Having felt the pulse of England, and received all the petitions that were presented on his line of march, he made up his mind to declare for a free parliament (Feb. 11, 1660). But he would not do anything illegally. Not only the 'Rump,' but all the surviving and accessible members of the Long Parliament which Colonel Pride had expelled twelve years before, were called together; and induced to agree to its own dissolution according to the statute, having previously issued writs for a general election. (March 16, 1660.) Strictly speaking, a Parliament can only be called together by the king's consent; so the newly elected representatives of the nation formed what is called a 'Convention.' It met April 25, 1660. In the meantime (April 14) Charles II. had issued a *Declaration from Breda* in which he promised a general amnesty to all save those whom Parliament should except, and liberty of conscience to all whose religious convictions were not likely to disturb the peace of the realm; he also agreed that Parliament should determine the conflicting claims of past and present holders of landed estates, and that the army should receive its arrears of pay. The Presbyterians were instrumental in obtaining this Declaration, and when it was announced (May 1) that Sir John Granville had brought letters from Charles—one for the Lords who had resumed their seats, one for the Commons, one for General Monk, and another for the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London—offering himself to their dutiful acceptance and acknowledgment as king; the news was received with marvellous enthusiasm. The national will was felt and obeyed at a time when none dared utter it; and Charles II. was invited unconditionally from exile to his paternal throne by a people who desired, above all else, a restoration of those institutions under which England had been prosperous and happy.

CHAPTER XXIV. (A.D. 1660–1685).

RESTORATION OF CHURCH AND REALM.

"He comes with rapture greeted, and caressed
With frantic love—his kingdom to regain.

* * * * *

Nor shall the eternal roll of praise reject
Those unconfirming; whom one rigorous day
Drives from their cures, a voluntary prey
To poverty, and grief, and disrespect."—*Wordsworth*.

1: The Return of the King.—On the 8th of May Charles II. was proclaimed King amid general rejoicings. On the 25th he landed at Dover, and thence proceeded to Canterbury. Thus the Restoration

was brought about without bloodshed, 'and by that very army which rebelled against him. The eagerness of men, women and children to see his majesty and kiss his hands was so great, that he had scarce leisure to eat for some days.' May 28th was a Sunday, and there was a grand service in the cathedral; than which no more fitting place could have been chosen for the formal and public restoration of the Prayer-book. The next day there was a triumphal progress to London, Whitehall being reached about 9 p.m. That night was made an artificial day by innumerable bonfires, while the wealthy erected wine fountains everywhere. Englishmen had greatly missed their dances round the maypole, their theatres, Church alcs, and other modes of recreation in which they had formerly delighted; and they now revolted from the hypocrisy that had accompanied Puritan restrictions by an intemperate enjoyment of all pleasures at once. In the unlimited exuberance of their delight the rejoicings were marred by disorderly mirth and profligacy. This was most deplorable, though not altogether unexpected; for proclamations had been issued against excesses. No one could doubt the feeling of the nation which had so long been ruled by a small and determined minority. The king declared that it must have been his own fault that he had stayed away so long, for he met no one who did not protest that his return had always been wished for. The Puritans were only too glad to be allowed to go into retirement. *John Milton, e.g.,* wrote:—

"This day a solemn feast the people hold
To Dagon, their sea-idol, and forbid
Laborious works. Unwillingly this rest
Their superstition leaves me; hence, with leave,
Retiring from the popular noise, I seek
This unfrequented place to find some ease.

In all difficulties and dangers the Church and the Crown had shared a common lot; they had suffered together in exile, imprisonment and death; it was only natural that they should be partners in the glad rejoicings of the Restoration. The sequestered clergy who were still alive, about a thousand in number, at once returned to their parishes; and everywhere the ancient Liturgy was heard again. The nine surviving bishops resumed control of their dioceses, and took their old places in the House of Peers. One of the bishops, Wren of Ely, had been kept as a prisoner in the Tower without trial nearly twenty years. Steps were then taken to fill the vacant sees with divines who had been conspicuous for their devotion to their Church and king during adversity; Bishop Juxon, who had ministered to Charles I. in his last moments, taking the place of Laud as primate. After the 'Convention Parliament' had voted the necessary funds for paying arrears to the soldiers, the army was disbanded; two or three regiments only being retained as a guard for the king. An 'Act of Indemnity and Oblivion' was passed by which all, except

the regicides, were pardoned for complicity in the late rebellion. At the close of the year the Convention Parliament was dissolved. By the following May a new Parliament, and a new Convocation, had been elected; which proved strongly royalist and true to Church principles. It was called the *Cavalier Parliament*; because most of the members belonged to families who had all along sided with the king. It was consequently opposed most strongly to Puritanism in any form, and it would not have been surprising had they used their power to revenge themselves upon their late enemies. That they proceeded to pass measures which bore hardly upon those who had preceded them in the government is true, but it is remarkable how very little grudge they seemed to bear. As we noticed when dealing with the Elizabethan reaction, nothing was done vindictively or in a hurry. Thousands of Puritan ministers were allowed to remain unmolested in the benefices to which they had been illegally presented, until an ecclesiastical settlement was determined on, and no repressive legislation was enacted unless past events had proved that the safety of the nation demanded it. The Church party grew stronger every day, and less inclined for compromise; but it was willing that Puritan ministers should be admitted within the Church if they would accept Episcopal ordination and use the ancient service book loyally. Three of the most eminent, Messrs. Baxter, Calamy, and Reynolds, were offered bishoprics, although only the last named accepted the honour; and nine others became chaplains to the king. The peculiar troubles which the land had lately undergone would have made it impossible to adjust religious differences without offending some one; but it was the extravagant demands of the Puritans that really prevented conciliation.

2. The Savoy Conference.—In the Declaration of Breda Charles had declared himself ready to consent to any act of Parliament which should grant toleration to Nonconformists; and because such toleration was not allowed the king has been accused of duplicity; whereas neither the Convention Parliament nor the Cavalier Parliament were disposed to offer such a Bill to him for his acceptance. The nation and the nation's representatives had declared against toleration of the sectaries; and in favour of uniformity according to the Book of Common Prayer that had been so long proscribed by Puritans. The king recognised that the Presbyterians had helped to bring about his restoration, and was desirous of contenting them; but he also felt that something was owing to the Romanists, who had stood by him when the Presbyterians fought against him, and he wished that whatever religious liberty might be agreed upon the Romanists should share in it. But the Puritans were all averse to sharing toleration with the Romanists; and would not accept any declaration of religious liberty in which they were mentioned in company. As Parliament was not in the mood for

toleration, and desired uniformity before all else, the Puritans endeavoured to obtain such concessions as would satisfy all their former objections to the Church. The king had told them to draw up a list of difficulties which stood in the way of peace and unity ; whereupon they drew up a long catalogue of objections to the doctrine, discipline, formularies, ceremonies and orders of the Church which entirely defeated their object ; because if their demands had been conceded the Catholic and apostolic character of the Church of England, to maintain which its members had endured suffering, imprisonment, exile and death, would have been entirely overthrown. As the Church was now in the

ascendant, with the nation at its back, it may be doubted whether the Puritans desired union on any terms, for they must have known that the bishops and clergy would never have agreed to such concessions. However a conference was arranged by the king, to be held at the palace of the Savoy, with twenty-one disputants on either side to debate the differences. It met April 15, 1661. *Bishop Sheldon* was the leader of the Church party, and *Richard Baxter* that of the Presbyterians. As at the Hampton Court Conference, the Prayer-book was made the battle ground : the noble Lit-



THE OLD SAVOY PALACE.

urgy that contained the forms of devotion by which thirty generations of Englishmen had offered public service to the Creator, that had been translated into the English tongue and compiled with much labour and loving care over a hundred years before the Savoy Conference had met. No wonder that, speaking in the name of his party, Bishop Sheldon should say that the Church of England was perfectly satisfied with it, and did not wish for changes ; although the bishops were ready to examine any written statements which Mr. Baxter and his friends might desire to put before the Conference in the way of suggested additions or alterations. This proposal was accepted, and in a fortnight Mr. Baxter produced a reformed liturgy

of his own composition, which he desired might be used as an alternative to the Book of Common Prayer by any ministers who did not see their way to use the old English Prayer-book. His colleagues were far less hasty, but he urged them on to draw up a paper of objections, which they presented on May 4. The bishops defended the Liturgy from these attacks, but offered a few concessions touching phraseology and ceremonial, to which Mr. Baxter replied. The Conference concluded without having arrived at any determination on the points at issue. 'All were agreed,' it was reported to the king, 'that unity and peace were ends to be desired; as to the means, they could not come to any harmony.'

3. The Revised Liturgy.—While the disputants were wrangling at the Savoy, the Cavalier Parliament had met; and on June 29 a bill was introduced to compel the uniform use of the second Prayer-book of Edward VI. (see page 71), which passed the House of Commons July 9. The bill was sent up to the Lords the following day, but no notice was taken of it there until the winter. The king, in the meantime, had commissioned several bishops and divines to review the Prayer-book, with a view of meeting some of the Puritan objections. As the result of their deliberations, letters of business were issued to the Convocations of Canterbury and York (October and November) empowering them to make such additions and alterations to the Prayer-book as should seem meet and convenient. This was done, and on Dec. 20 all the members of both houses of Convocation subscribed the amended book and presented it to the king; with some services for use upon special occasions. All which the king, privy council, and lawyers examined, to see that nothing illegal was contained in them. The council kept the revised book from December 20 to February 25, 1662, when it was sent to the house of Lords with a letter of approval from the king. The House of Lords did not consider it until March 13. After four days' discussion they agreed that the new 'Act of Uniformity' should refer to this revised book, and not to the second book of Edward VI. On April 10 the Act of Uniformity was returned to the Commons, who asked to see the original folio copy in which the alterations of Convocation had been written, so that they might more easily judge of the changes made. The Commons agreed to accept the amended book; and the Act of Uniformity by which all incumbents were to use it on and after August 24 received the royal assent, May 19, 1662. Some 600 changes were made altogether, mostly of a minor character, such as the substitution of modern for obsolete words, and the substitution of the 1611 translation of most extracts from Scripture. A special service for the Baptism of Adults was added; because during the Commonwealth, and owing to 'the growth of Anabaptism,' large numbers had grown up from infancy without admission to the Saviour's fold. It was thought that this service though at first drawn up for tem-

porary use in England, might be 'useful for the baptising of natives in our plantations, and others converted to the Faith.'¹ Now that a decision had been arrived at, as to the limits beyond which Churchmen could not go, the Puritan incumbents who had been intruded during the Commonwealth were told that they must renounce the Covenant, accept ordination and pay canonical obedience, subscribe the Articles and use the Prayer-book, if they wished to continue in their benefices. Those who conformed were not removed, and they were the greater number. It was expected that many of the intruded incumbents would decline to agree to the change; and altogether about 1,800 were removed after the three months' notice had expired;² but the fact that nearly 6,000 were content to accept the conditions, and remain in possession, may be taken as proof that the points of agreement between men, even at that time, were far more than the points of difference. Although everybody knew that there would be a proportion of ministers who, on account of their training or political partisanship, would reject any concessions that might be made; it is none the less to be regretted that so many felt themselves unable to comply. It is doubly to be regretted, because after their refusal they became the founders of modern Dissenting bodies. On the other hand its loyal use by subsequent generations for over 200 years shews that the hope of the Restoration reviewers has been realized:—'that what is here presented, and hath been by the Convocations of both provinces with great diligence examined and approved, will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England.' Several proposals have since been made to alter and adapt the Liturgy as so revised, but they have come to nothing at present, and with the sole exception of the revised list of lessons adopted by Convocation in 1871, and legalised in 1872 by Parliament, there has been no alteration in the Book of Common Prayer since 1662. The occasional services for special days were only bound up with the Prayer-book for the sake of convenience. Inasmuch as the Prayer-book is now the common possession of all members of the Anglican communion, revision by any branch might so seriously affect other portions, that alterations are discountenanced.

4. Repressive Legislation.—It has sometimes been stated that the 1,800 nonconforming ministers were very harshly treated, and that an indecent haste was made to rush repressive and vindictive measures through Parliament. This is distinctly untrue. A comparison of the dates in the foregoing section will show that the Act of Uniformity was nearly a year in passing, and that it did not come into force until two years after the Restoration. Every sensible person must have known that some such measures would have been

¹ For details of the changes the reader is referred to the Prayer-book histories mentioned on page 86. ² Neal, *Hist. Purit.*, vol. III, p. 35, and IV, p. 339.

taken ; and most men of that time were aware that the Act of Uniformity did no more than restore things to the position in which they were on the accession of Charles I. The Act was a much milder one than that of the Long Parliament which mercilessly expelled all clergy from their rightful benefices who would not perjure themselves by taking the Covenanters' oath. It was not until 1664 that the *Conventicle Act* was passed by which all unauthorized assemblies for religious purposes were visited with fines and imprisonments. But it was not passed until there had been a rising against the Government by some fanatical sectaries, which gave occasion for the excuse that Nonconformist meetings were sometimes used to promote rebellion, and that therefore their suppression was needed for the safety of the Realm. Here, too, it might be urged that the Conventicle Acts of 1664 and 1670 were much less severe than those



ELSTOW CHURCH (*see next page*).

which the Commonwealth had produced against the Royalists, because whereas Puritans were now permitted to have five strangers join in their family worship, Churchmen then were not allowed to have any visitors at all. It seems very hard when we hear that an Act was passed, in the autumn of 1665, which forbade ministers settling within five miles of a corporate town where they had formerly preached ; but when we find that it was only enforced upon those who refused to take the oath of *Non-Resistance* (which declared that taking arms against the king or endeavouring to subvert the government in Church or Realm was unlawful) its virulence becomes modified to our minds ; and this statute was mildness itself compared with the powers assumed by the Cromwellians, when they sent high-minded clergymen to the hulks, and kept them there, for no other offence than obedience to their ordination vows. But just as we could not approve the violence of Cromwell's, so neither are

we desirous of excusing the intolerance of Charles's Parliament, even though the latter had a greater show of reason. It is possible that the desire of Charles II. to exalt his prerogative at the expense of Parliament, by issuing a *Declaration of Indulgence* to Nonconformists on the ground that he had an inherent right to dispense with Statute laws, may have increased the determination of the legislature to make their own power felt. The most deplorable acts of the Restoration were those which imposed the Sacramental Test upon public officials. To make the Saviour's ordinance of love and mercy a means of over-reaching political opponents was hardly the way to promote peace and goodwill. The Presbyterians and Independents did not suffer very much under the Conventicle and Five Mile Acts. The chief sufferers were Quakers and Anabaptists, whom the Puritans themselves had treated with great hardships under the Commonwealth. The best known example of the persecuted Nonconformists was John Bunyan, whose *Pilgrim's Progress* has made his name universally beloved throughout the world. He lived at Elstow in Bedfordshire where there may still be seen a little Norman Church with 'Early English' and 'Perpendicular' additions; and a separate campanile tower wherein the rude jests of the ringers filled Bunyan's sensitive soul with loathing. He married when a very wild young man, but his wife persuaded him to listen to the ministrations of the minister who had been intruded upon Elstow parish during the Great Rebellion. He had shouldered a musket in the Independent army, and ultimately broke away from all ecclesiastical discipline by joining the Anabaptists and preaching on his own account. He was one of the first to be imprisoned after the Restoration, and for twelve years he was lodged in Bedford jail. His incarceration is often quoted by modern adversaries of the Church as an instance of intolerant clericalism; but they overlook the circumstances of his day. The sufferings and privations he endured after his schism must be laid to the charge of the civil magistrates; not to the Church, as such. The same is true with all the imprisoned and afflicted Puritans. Because private and unauthorised meeting-houses and preachments were thought to be seditious, and the late troubles were fresh in men's minds, special efforts were taken by the Government to restrict the extemporaneous utterances of irresponsible enthusiasts, whether in devotional exercises or pulpit deliverances, lest they should be used as means of provoking resistance to the civil authorities. That there was no intention of treating the loyal Puritans with harshness is clear from the fact that an attempt was made in 1667, and 1668, to comprehend Presbyterians and others within the Church of England. The scheme had a good intent no doubt, but it was impracticable. It failed because it could only be made feasible by whittling away all the distinctive Church teaching from the Prayer-book. Besides, those for whom the greatest sacrifices had been made, would have been the first to stir up strife within the fold by their eccentric methods.

5. **The Great Plague.**—Two terrible calamities followed hard upon the Restoration. The first was a terrible infectious disease which broke out in London A.D. 1665, called the *Plague*. It had visited towns and villages in our country before though never so badly as now. Want of sanitary precautions had much to do with it; for the drainage of London was bad, the streets were narrow and dirty, and the habits of the lower classes the reverse of cleanly. Though this would account for the origin of the disease, and imperfect knowledge of medical science prevented the scourge from being cured or its progress arrested, yet the people of that day considered it to be a judgment from heaven upon the unparalleled wickedness that was everywhere apparent. Indeed many thought it impious to attempt to arrest the judgment of God by trying to cure the fearful affliction. Orders were given to shut up every house that was infected, and a red cross was painted on the street door; over which were inscribed the words 'Lord have mercy upon us.' The summer of that year was unusually hot, and by September the epidemic was raging at its height; 7,000 and 8,000 being carried off every week. It was im-



PLAGUE PITS, FINSBURY.

possible to bury the dead in the usual way nor could the undertakers supply coffins quickly enough. Great pits were dug at Aldgate, Moorfields, and Finsbury; eighteen to twenty feet deep and of immense width and length, into which the corpses were thrown. Carts went regular rounds at night, preceded by a man who rang a bell and cried, 'Bring out your dead.' Daniel Defoe relates that he had the curiosity to visit a plague pit by night

to see the mode of interment; but had some difficulty in obtaining admission to the ground because of the danger of infection. "I told the sexton," he writes, "I had been pressed in my mind to go, and that perhaps it might be an instructing sight, that might not be without its uses. 'Nay,' says the good man, 'if you will venture on that score, i' the name of God, go in; for depend upon it, 'twill be a sermon to you; it may be the best that you ever heard in your life. It is a speaking sight, and has a voice with it, and a loud one, to call us to repentance.'" Rich people fled in terror—leaving the poor to shift for themselves. A few noble-minded men, like John Evelyn and the Duke of Albemarle remained, as the representatives of benevolence and order; but the city was mostly deserted, and grass grew in the streets. It is estimated that over 100,000 people died of the scourge during that fatal summer and autumn. By winter time the plague had lessened in its fury, and men commenced to make good the dilapidations of the city. John Evelyn tells us that he went with other eminent men to discuss plans for completing the restoration of Old St. Paul's; (see Vol. I., p. 71) which Archbishop Laud had munificently commenced. The spire which had been the highest in the world (48 feet higher than the great pyramid) had fallen down long before; and they agreed to replace it by 'a noble cupola.' But in less than a week after their conference a second calamity ensued which altered all their schemes.

6. The Fire of London.—On September 2, 1666, a disastrous fire broke out in Pudding Lane, near Fish Street Hill, E.C., where the *Monument* now stands. The houses of Old London were built chiefly of wood, and as the streets were very narrow the conflagration rapidly spread. A steady east wind carried the flames westward until London was wrapped in a fire so great and continuous that its reflection could be seen for several days and forty miles around. John Evelyn wrote: (Sept. 3) "I took coach with my wife and son and went to the bank side in Southwark, where we beheld a dismal spectacle, the whole city in dreadful flames near the waterside; all the houses from the bridge, all Thames Street, and upwards towards Cheapside, were now consumed. . . . so as it burned both in breadth and length, the churches, public halls, Exchange, hospitals, monuments, and ornaments, leaping after a prodigious manner from house to house and street to street, at great distances one from the other; for the heat, with a long set of fair and warm weather, had even ignited the air, and prepared the materials to conceive the fire, which devoured after an incredible manner houses, furniture, and everything. . . . God grant mine eyes may never behold the like, who now saw above 10,000 houses all in one flame." Charles II. and his courtiers superintended the pulling down and blowing up of houses to make broad gaps which the fire could not overleap and at last, after four days, the progress of the fearful fire

was stayed. Eighty-nine churches had been engulfed in the vortex including the metropolitan cathedral. Evelyn (who was charged to stay the flames northward by blowing up the houses near Holborn) in the record of his visit to the ruins on the 4th day of the fire, tells us:—‘I was infinitely concerned to find that goodly church of St. Paule’s now a sad ruine. . . . It was astonishing to see what immense stones the heat had in a manner calcined, so that all the ornaments, columnes, freezes, capitals, and projectures of massive Portland stone flew off, even to the very roof, where a sheet of lead covering a great space (no less than 6 acres by measure) was totally melted; the ruins of the vaulted roof falling broke into St. Faith’s which, being filled with the magazines of books belonging to the



VIEW OF THE FIRE OF LONDON (FROM SOUTHWARK).

stationers, and carried thither for safety, were all consumed, burning for a week following. . . . Thus lay in ashes that most venerable church, one of the most ancient pieces of early piety in the Christian world, besides near 100 more.’

7. A Great Architect.—In spite of the suffering caused by the fire, much good resulted from it; for it destroyed the old houses that had been infected by the plague, and the city was newly laid out and rebuilt in brick or stone on more healthy principles. It was a splendid opportunity for producing a great architect. and one was

soon found; as appears by the following note in Evelyn's Diary, May 5, 1667. 'Came to dine with me Sir William Fermor, and *Sir Christopher Wren*, his Majesty's Architect and Surveyor, now building the Cathedral of St. Paul, and the Column in memory of the city's conflagration, and was in hand with the building of 50 parish churches. A wonderful genius had this incomparable person.' Only fifty-one of the eighty-nine churches were rebuilt, the other thirty-five parishes being united with some one or other of those that were. The distress occasioned by this fire was only of a temporary character. Evelyn says he did not hear of a single bankrupt. There was a vast amount of sympathy excited for the sufferers, but their own energy was the most remarkable. They readily taxed themselves for many years to come, with charges for relaying roads and rebuilding wharves and prisons, by agreeing to a limited impost on every ton of coals brought to London

—which was renewed by Act of Parliament from time to time—and a fifth portion of this was afterwards appropriated towards the rebuilding of the fifty-one churches. Against this apparent boon to the Church must be placed the fact that the sites of all the 89 churches and the churchyards, vicarages, etc., belonging thereto were vested in the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the city; who had the first claim upon such portions of Church lands as were thought requisite for widening and improving the city streets. Some of



THE MONUMENT, E.C.

the churches then built are plain to ugliness. In very few cases was there any provision made for a chancel, the chief object being to make the buildings as little like pre-Reformation churches as possible, and more like the temples of Greece and Old Rome, or the mosques of Constantinople. Although there is much to commend them from an utilitarian standpoint, Wren's buildings lack congruity. They are colossal enough, but they miss the romantic and poetic grace by which the mysteries of mediæval architecture appeal to our feelings, imaginations, and recollections. There had been so little church building for 150 years that very few people knew how to build at all. It was of no consequence which style they imitated

and the oldest style would look most like a new creation. Some of the city churches are remarkable for the carved woodwork of *Grinling Gibbons*, which found a host of admirers and imitators. Wren's chief work was the cathedral church of London, but that was not commenced until 1675, because it took a long time to prepare the plans and clear away the ruins.

8. The Church in Scotland.—It was not to be expected that the restoration of Church and King, which had proved so popular in England, would be withheld from the sister kingdoms; although their conditions were so very different. Charles II. had twice signed the Covenant in Scotland in Cromwell's time; and the Presbyterians there, naturally hoping that he would be true to it, commissioned one of their chief ministers, *James Sharp*, to plead the cause of Presbyterianism at Breda and in London. But when Sharp found that few or none of the English desired Presbyterianism, he made up his mind to swim with the stream, and recommend the restoration of Episcopacy in Scotland. The Episcopate refounded in the reign of James I. had died out during the Great Rebellion, so that it was necessary to create a fresh succession. Sharp was appointed to the archbishopric of St. Andrew's, and consecrated with three others—Dr. Hamilton, Dr. Leighton, and Dr. Fairfoul—in Westminster Abbey (1661). These four prelates then proceeded to revive all the ancient Scotch dioceses, and consecrated bishops to fill them. Presbyterians beyond the Tweed were exceedingly wrath with Sharp for having betrayed their cause; and he resented their enmity by using his power as chief of the Scottish council to enforce the repressive legislation against Dissenters. Some of the more fanatical of the Scotch Covenanters broke out into open rebellion; and on May 3, 1679, while driving with his daughters across a lonely moor, Archbishop Sharp was murdered by a band of Cameronians. Had Dr. Robert Leighton, a saintly and a learned man, been made archbishop of St. Andrew's instead of Sharp, the subsequent history of the Episcopal Church in Scotland might have been very different. At a time when conciliation and compromise were of the first necessity Sharp adopted harsh and arrogant methods; with the result that ten years after his death all attempts to re-establish Episcopacy in Scotland were abandoned (see pages 202—4).

9. National Dread of Romanism.—The exile of the Stuart princes during the Commonwealth caused them to look favourably upon Romanism. Their mother, *Henrietta Maria*, sister of the French king, had obtained hospitality for them and their friends in the courts of Europe; and after the Restoration common gratitude demanded that such obligations should be in some sort repaid; but not at the expense of the National Church. Charles II. had married a Romanist princess, *Catharine of Braganza*, and his sister Henrietta,

who was married to the Duke of Orleans, introduced some notorious Frenchwomen to the English court; who wielded unbounded influence over him. In 1672 his brother *James*, duke of York and heir presumptive to the throne (for Catharine had no children), publicly avowed his membership with the Church of Rome; and it was feared that King Charles might follow the example. Moreover, the Stuart princes continued to cherish the hope of restoring absolute monarchy; and although Charles II. preferred to submit to his Parliament, rather than set out on his travels again, he was continually trying to obtain three things:—a standing army, by which he could make himself independent of the legislature, as his father and Oliver Cromwell had done; money, by which he could keep up a profligate court; and the abolition of the anti-papal statutes, which prevented his Romanist friends from receiving lucrative positions in crown patronage. The Cavalier Parliament had proved so desirous of pleasing the king that, after 11 years, Charles began to think he could do as he pleased with it; so on March 15, 1672, he took advantage of a parliamentary recess to publish a *Declaration of Indulgence* to all who did not conform to the Prayer-book. By this the Romanists were allowed to worship privately after their desire, and Dissenters permitted to conduct services both publicly and privately. This was chiefly intended as a means by which Charles might appoint Romanists to naval and military offices, from which they were excluded by the law. The unchallenged acceptance of such a declaration would be equivalent to an acknowledgment that the king had power to dispense with Parliament; seeing that a large number of statutes were set aside by it without the consent of the estates of the realm. Great dissatisfaction was freely expressed by the people, and when Charles II. joined France in the war against Holland (March 1672) it was current gossip that most of the officers in the army and navy were Romanists. It is worthy of note that the leading Dissenters preferred to abide by their disabilities rather than share the 'Indulgence' with the papal party. When Parliament reassembled, the document was at once pronounced unlawful. Then it was that the famous *Test Act* was passed (25 Car. II., c. 2), which for many years after bore hardly on Romanists. By it all civil, military, and naval officers were obliged to take the oath of allegiance and supremacy, deny the doctrine of transubstantiation, and receive Holy Communion according to the rites of the National Church. No Romanist could fulfil these conditions; and a large number of officers, headed by the Duke of York who was Lord High Admiral, gave up their posts. So many resigned that the nation became alarmed for the reformed faith, and the fear spread to the legislature. Members of Parliament then began to take sides, and to be called contemptuous names by their political opponents. On one side were those who thought it wrong to resist the king's prerogative, and they were stigmatised as *Tories* after the Irish Romanist banditti; and on the other side

were those who thought that it would be allowable to take up arms in defence of religious and civil liberties—even against the king—and these were nicknamed *Whigs*, after the insurgent Presbyterians of Scotland.¹ Lord Shaftesbury led the Whigs, and he was supported by all the anti-papal members. His great aim was to prevent Prince James from succeeding to the Throne. James had married a daughter of Lord Clarendon, an English Churchwoman. They had two children, Mary and Anne, who were brought up in the Church of England. In 1677 Mary was married to William, Prince of Orange; and subsequently Anne became the wife of Prince George of Denmark; both staunch upholders of 'Protestantism' in its most extreme forms. Lord Shaftesbury knew that he must set up a claimant to the throne instead of James, and he strongly supported an illegitimate son of Charles II., known as the Duke of Monmouth; and encouraged rumours that the king was secretly married to Monmouth's mother, who was a woman of obscure family. There were many persons opposed to Prince James who liked Monmouth still less; and these thought that the Princess Mary and the Prince of Orange should be called to the throne, on the demise of Charles without legitimate issue.

10. Popish Plots.—About this time (Oct., 1678) the country was alarmed by a reported conspiracy among the Jesuits to kill King Charles and introduce papal authority. This fell in with Shaftesbury's plans, and he took care to encourage the rumours. The author's name was *Titus Oates*. By falsely representing himself as a Romanist he obtained admission into the society of Jesuits; and having gained a little knowledge of their designs, to establish Romanism in England through the aid of the French and English courts, he proceeded to invent a number of wild stories incriminating very many innocent people; who were allowed by Charles and James to suffer the extreme penalty of the law, in order to draw off suspicion from themselves. The nation was now in great ferment, and Parliament passed a still more stringent Test Act (30 Car. II., c. 1) by which Romanists were excluded from sitting in either house of Parliament. Hitherto the peers had not been liable to the provisions of the Supremacy and Test Acts. By two votes only the Lords exempted the Duke of York from the new statute, but public opinion was so strong against him that he had to leave England for a time. It is probable that the pretended discoveries of Titus Oates were fabricated from beginning to end; but there certainly was a deliberate intention on the part of James and other members of the court to subvert the National Church; and there were as certainly secret treaties between Charles II. and Louis XIV., by which the latter kept the former well supplied with money, on the understanding that England should

¹ These party names, chosen at first to express the *acme* of derision for antagonistic politicians, have since been accepted as honourable designations, although each party have greatly modified their opinions.

not go to war against France, and that Charles should become a Romanist. The public had long been suspicious of some such secret arrangement, but did not know for certain until Louis had them disclosed to the House of Commons. The secret had been shared by several Romanist peers, and also by a cabinet minister named Lord Danby; and these were impeached forthwith. To save his confidants Charles dissolved the Cavalier Parliament (Jan. 1679) and called another. Shaftesbury had long been waiting for a general election, and had carefully prepared the way for a grand anti-papal demonstration at the hustings, by fomenting the terror that Oates had aroused. An overwhelming majority of Whig members were returned (March, 1679) who would not be satisfied with anything short of the exclusion of Prince James from the throne. Charles thereupon dissolved it, and called another, with a similar result, Oct., 1679. After seven prorogations in the hope that public opinion might veer round, Charles allowed the new Parliament to meet for the despatch of business in Oct., 1680. But the Exclusion Bill blocked the way. The Commons passed it but the Lords did not, for the king had sent a message that he would never give his consent if it were passed. The Commons then flatly refused to vote supply, and Parliament was again dissolved. Yet another Parliament was called with the same result. It met at Oxford in March, 1681. This time the Whig members came attended with armed retainers; so determined were they that the Exclusion Bill, for which they had been thrice returned, should not again miscarry. Charles at once brought down his guards, and many feared that civil war might break out afresh. The king offered as a compromise that William, Prince of Orange, the husband of the Princess Mary, should act as Regent when James succeeded. But Parliament was determined upon the Exclusion Bill, so Charles dissolved it in despair before it had sat a fortnight, and did not call another for the rest of his reign. All the time the Whigs were fighting over this matter large numbers of Romanists were being put to death on the false accusations of Oates and others, who found profit and popularity in becoming informers; *e.g.*, Titus Oates obtained a pension of £1,200 a year, and a residence at *Whitehall* close to the palace of the king. Charles II. did not attempt to save the accused persons, although his sympathies were with them; for he rightly judged that if the Whig party could be sufficiently imbrued with the blood of innocent persons, public sympathy would be excited for the Romanists, and James would stand more chance. The most noted victim of the pretended plot was Lord Stafford, who was tried and executed in December, 1680.¹ His speech to the multitudes assembled to see him beheaded, in which he declared his innocence, was responded to by sympathetic shouts of "We believe you, my Lord! God bless you, my Lord!" From that time the public discredited

¹ A contemporary report of the trial appears in *Evelyn's Diary*, an invaluable record of the years 1641-1705.—F. Warne & Co. 2s.

the informers of the popish plot, and began to appreciate the king's reluctance to disinherit his brother. When the fever heat of the nation had somewhat subsided, and his popularity returned, Charles renewed the treaties with Louis XIV.—in order to provide himself with money for the expenses of his court without the assistance of Parliament. A counterblast against the Whigs was then invented by the Romanists, and Shaftesbury fled to Holland. The *Rye House Plot* to murder the king and his brother on their way from Newmarket to London was also charged against the party; Lord Russell, Algernon Sidney, with other leading Whigs, being executed for alleged complicity, (1683) although the charges were certainly not proven. After that the king's party did as they pleased. The Duke of York resumed his position as Admiral; and it became certain that he would succeed to the throne. Charles II. was seized



WHITEHALL (*temp.* CHARLES II.).

with sudden sickness, and died Feb. 6, 1685. Up to the last his real religious convictions were unknown. Archbishop Sancroft and other prelates were in attendance during his last hours; and Bishop Ken pronounced the Church's absolution over him, after receiving an affirmative reply to the question, "Sire, are you sorry for the sins you have committed?" They pressed him to receive the Holy Communion, but he evaded their suggestions. It was afterwards given out that a Romish priest named Huddleston, who had assisted in the escape of Charles after the battle of Worcester, had secretly administered the last rites of the Roman Church to him during the temporary absence of the courtiers. It is now considered certain that Charles II. had been a Romanist for years before his death.

11. **The Church in Ireland.**—The Celtic Irish had never willingly emancipated themselves from the usurped control of the papacy, and the adherents of the reformed episcopate consisted chiefly of the descendants of Elizabethan colonists. When Cromwell put down the Irish Rebellion, many of the poorer people were banished, and the better classes compelled to emigrate; their lands and possessions being divided amongst adventurers who had furnished him with the sinews of war. Episcopacy was then suppressed, and its place taken by Independency and Presbyterianism. At the Restoration the Irish bishops who had survived the Commonwealth resumed control of their sees, and Jeremy Taylor was appointed to one of the vacant dioceses. Puritan ministers who subscribed to the Liturgy and Articles under the Irish Act of Uniformity (1666) were allowed to remain undisturbed, although they looked with great disfavour on the steps that were taken to enforce obedience to Episcopal rule. The Bible and Prayer-book were translated into Irish about the same time. Had it not been for political troubles much might have been done towards healing past wounds, and joining the scattered bodies of Christians into an harmonious Church. Charles II. had promised the Cromwellian settlers that they might keep the lands they had acquired; but this caused disaffection among the native gentry who had fought in his behalf, and stirred them up to enmity against the Puritan party. The disaffection increased when James II. succeeded to the English throne and placed Ireland under the rule of *Lord Tyrconnel*. Romanists were then put in the places of all civil and military officers who were unfavourable to the King's religion; benefices and sees were kept vacant with the intention of presenting them to Romanists before long; while Romish priests were allowed to collect and appropriate the revenues of tithes and glebe lands. Under all these circumstances it was not likely that the Church should prosper. Indeed the Anglican clergy were subject to such persecution, under Tyrconnel's rule, that they fled from the country until the Prince of Orange brought them back.



CHAPTER XXV. (A.D. 1685-1690).

THE SEVEN BISHOPS.

A voice, from long-expecting thousands sent,
 Shatters the air, and troubles tower and spire—
 For justice hath absolved the innocent,
 And tyranny is baulked of her desire.
 Up, down, the busy Thames—rapid as fire
 Coursing a train of gunpowder—it went,
 And transport finds in every street a vent,
 Till the whole city rings like one vast choir.”—*Wordsworth.*

1. James II. and the Puritans.—Immediately after his brother's death the Duke of York took his seat at the council board as *James II.* He at once gave a solemn pledge to defend and support the National Church; and received a loyal address in the name of the clergy from the bishops who were at court, they believing him to be a man of his word. But he took the earliest opportunity of demonstrating that he did not intend to withhold his allegiance to the Church of Rome, by going publicly to ‘Mass.’ At his coronation Archbishop Sancroft consented to omit the English Communion Service, and has been blamed for such complacency. But it was surely better for him to have done so than to have allowed the Sacrament to be profaned, by insisting upon its reception by one who did not hesitate to express his contempt for it. James acknowledged freely that his accession was due to the loyalty of Churchmen to the doctrine of hereditary right, but made no secret of his aversion to the Whigs and Puritans who had tried so hard to exclude him from the throne. Very soon after the coronation the Duke of Monmouth attempted an armed usurpation, which gave James an excuse for raising an army. Monmouth landed at Lyme Regis, in Dorset, and called upon the Nonconformists to aid his pretensions. None of the Whig nobles joined his cause, but many agriculturists and miners of the West of England flocked to the standard that the young ladies of Taunton presented to him. At the same time the Presbyterians of Scotland had fomented a rising under the chief of the Campbells. Both these rebellions were promptly suppressed, and most vindictive measures taken against the leaders. In the west of England the prisoners of war were hanged by scores in cold blood, until the good bishop of Bath and Wells (*Thomas Ken*) demanded that the victims should not be executed without trial. His good offices did not avail them much, for *Chief-Justice Jeffreys* was sent down to try them; with the result that numbers were condemned to death, and many hundreds more mutilated, imprisoned, transported and enslaved. Summary vengeance had already been taken under cover of the law, with the same cruel and blasphemous man for judge, upon the informers of the popish plots. Titus Oates was

condemned to a life-long imprisonment, with periodical floggings of terrible severity; but he bore his punishment with wonderful firmness, and lived until the next reign, when he was liberated and again pensioned. The Presbyterians of Scotland and England had next to feel the enmity of James II. The death penalty was imposed, by a statute of the Scottish Parliament, on every one who should preach in a room or attend an open air conventicle; and the acceptance of the Covenant was made high treason. The existing laws against English Nonconformists also were strictly enforced, and the first to feel this hardship was the erstwhile leader of the Presbyterian party, Richard Baxter. Our picture represents him standing before Judge Jeffreys, to answer a charge of sedition for reflecting on the




THE TRIAL OF RICHARD BAXTER.

office of bishops. He admitted that he had spoken sharply about bishops of the Church of Rome, but claimed that he had always spoken honourably of the English prelates, and incurred the censure of dissenters thereby. And this was shown by his writings. But as the time-serving judge had instructions to silence Baxter the counsel were browbeaten, the defendant insulted, and the jury intimidated until an adverse verdict was obtained. Baxter was thereupon sentenced to a heavy fine; and was imprisoned for 18 months in default.

2. Non-Resistance.—It was soon found that no one could expect favour from James II., who did not speak respectfully of the

Church of Rome. In the second session of his Parliament (Nov. 1685) he desired that the *Test Act* (see page 174) might be repealed, so that his Romanist friends might be able to hold office in the army; but by the narrow majority of one the House of Commons decided against its repeal. The king prorogued the session in anger, and his Parliament never met again. James then proceeded to carry out his long-cherished plan, of introducing Romanism, by virtue of the royal prerogative. He appointed a Romanist gentleman to a command in the army, and then had a test case set up against himself in the law courts; with the view of obtaining a judicial decision as to whether he was not able to dispense with the laws in favour of individuals, just as he might grant a pardon to a man who had been condemned to death by the law. The judges, who had been carefully selected for their subserviency, decided that he could (June 1686); although every one knew that the exercise of royal prerogatives had been strictly limited, and that such a decision must be subversive of all authority and law. If it were lawful for the king to dispense with the laws in favour of one man for reasons of his own, he might dispense with them in favour of any number of men; and as Parliament was not allowed to sit he proceeded to do so to an unlimited extent; so that the decision of the judges had the effect of making him an absolute monarch, uncontrollable by Parliament. Romanists resumed their seats in the House of Lords; and four of them, with the Queen's Jesuit confessor, *Father Petre*, were sworn in as members of the Privy Council. The Savoy Palace became a college for the Jesuits; monks and friars paraded the streets as in the mediæval times; and the full Roman ritual was set up at the Chapels Royal of St. James' and Whitehall, to which the king went regularly in state. A papal nuncio was afterwards received at Windsor as ambassador to the English court, with the most subservient homage; and the influential men of the day were called in turn to a private audience with James, in the hope that they might be persuaded to become Romanists. But no proselyte of importance was made by such means. On the contrary, a tempest of indignation was aroused in the breasts of nine-tenths of the people; and the clergy, though submitting with sorrow to the indignities heaped upon themselves, were stirred up to a noble defence of the National Church, her doctrines, history, and privileges against the flowing tide of papalists. James saw that the English clergy had much the best of the arguments, and issued injunctions to restrain them from controversial preaching. But the injunctions failed to have the effect desired. James then revived the *High Commission Court* (July 1686), with Judge Jeffreys, now lord chancellor, at its head, to summon and examine all clergy who continued to demonstrate by their preaching the apostolic character of the Church of England. A London rector (Dr. Sharp) was accused before it of using insulting language towards the king's religion; whereupon the commissioners ordered the bishop of London to

suspend him. The bishop (Compton) declined, on the ground that he was the judge before whom the clergyman would have to be tried, and it would prejudice the case were he, by suspension, to assume the clergyman's guilt. The commissioners were so angry at being thus foiled that they passed over the clergyman and suspended the bishop instead. These acts of tyranny were not likely to preserve the peace of the country. Father Petre was the chief adviser of James II. ; but he also appeared to pay particular attention, for a time at least, to the famous Quaker, *William Penn*—the latter being the son of Admiral Penn, who had taught the king seamanship, and the founder of the American State which bears his name. Penn's object was to obtain toleration for all religious beliefs ; and



CATHEDRAL OF CHRISTCHURCH, OXFORD.

James agreed with him to a certain extent because his arguments could be applied to his own religion. 1,500 Quakers, and a still larger number of Romanists, were released from confinement ; but the 'Puritan' malcontents remained in bondage. A few time-serving clergy were found willing to declare themselves of the king's religion, and these obtained dispensations from James to continue holding their benefices. The king then proceeded to appoint Romanists to such preferments in his patronage as fell vacant, the most notable being *John Massey*, whom he made Dean of Christchurch, Oxford ;

having previously appointed *Samuel Parker* as its Bishop, who, if not a Romanist had accepted objectionable Romanist doctrines. James also desired the University of Cambridge to grant the M.A. degree to a monk named Francis; and when the Senate refused, because the monk declined to take the necessary oaths, the Vice-Chancellor and eight others, including the great philosopher *Isaac Newton*, were summoned before the new commission court and punished. But his most ill advised proceeding was the endeavour to force a notoriously dissolute Romanist, one *Anthony Farmer*, upon the fellows of Magdalen College, Oxford, as their president. The fellows refused to elect him, and appointed *Dr. Hough*, one of their own body, instead, April 1687. They were all cited before the High Commission, which declared Hough's election invalid. The proofs of Farmer's unfitness were so plain that his name was dropped by the court, and the Fellows were ordered to elect Bishop Parker for their president. They declined, on the ground that Hough was now their president. James then came to Oxford with a troop of soldiers and expelled the fellows. Bishop Parker was installed by proxy, but he died soon after, and his place was filled by a Roman vicar apostolic. The fellows were all deprived and succeeded by Romanists, who turned the college into a papal seminary. Considering that fellowships are recognised as freeholds, this was as arbitrary a proceeding as could well be imagined. It made a great sensation throughout England. Yet there was no active opposition on the part of the Church, and no attempt at rebellion of any kind; for the clergy were pledged to the doctrine of *Non-Resistance*. Archbishop Sancroft wrote a letter about that time to Princess Mary of Orange which exactly described the minds of Churchmen. "All we have endured cannot in the least shake or alter our steady loyalty to our sovereign and the royal family, in the legal succession of it; yet it embitters the very comforts that are left us, it blasts all our present joys, and makes us sit down with sorrow in dust and ashes."

3. The Declaration of Indulgence.—Although there was no open opposition, it was easy for James to see that his actions had aroused much hatred against Romanism; and this was increased by Tyrconnell's administration of Ireland. The abhorrence of Papal methods was still further excited by the constant stream of Huguenot refugees from France. After the religious war that followed upon the massacre of St. Bartholomew (see page 94), the French King Henry IV. issued the *Edict of Nantes*, A.D., 1598; by which the Huguenots were allowed the free exercise of their religious opinions, and the reservation of certain fortified towns, as La Rochelle (see page 123), where they might dwell securely when persecution should arise. We have seen that the latter provision was violated by Richelieu, and in 1683 the persecutions broke out afresh. The least show of resistance was made the excuse for military massacres,

and the poor Huguenots were forced to fly. In 1685 the edict of Nantes was revoked altogether, and fearful sufferings were borne by the oppressed. Hundreds came to England, and were welcomed with open arms. Their narration of the sufferings they had borne increased the national hatred of papal intolerance, and made it all the more difficult for James II. to fulfil his designs. Finding that the loyal Churchmen were beginning to be lukewarm and unfavourable he left off persecuting the Nonconformists; and sought to enlist their sympathies and good will by publishing a *Declaration of Indulgence* (April, 1687); which suspended all penal statutes against Romanists and Dissenters, abolished religious tests, and pardoned all who were undergoing penalties for their peculiar beliefs. But the *ruse* did not succeed. The efforts made to obtain addresses of thanks for this remarkable act of royal clemency had the most ludicrous results. Bishop Parker managed to persuade one clergyman in the diocese of Oxford to sign such an address, and two complacent priests were found in the diocese of Bristol. A few Anabaptists and other extreme sects, altogether insignificant in numbers and influence took advantage of the document and thanked the king; but the great bulk of Dissenters refused to accept a toleration that was only offered for the sake of licensing papalism. They knew that if the words of the declaration were 'softer than butter' there was 'war in its heart.' In Nov., 1687, James thought of calling another Parliament, and he asked the lords lieutenant of counties to furnish him with names of persons not belonging to the Church of England, whom he might nominate as candidates for election; notwithstanding that the law prevented anyone from sitting as a member who would not subscribe the Church formularies. Many of the lords lieutenant resigned their posts rather than comply with this illegal order. In April, 1688, James re-issued the Declaration of Indulgence, on the ground that it had not been sufficiently made known; and followed it up with this remarkable order.

"*At the Court at Whitehall, May 4.*—It is this day ordered by his Majesty in Council that his Majesty's late gracious Declaration, bearing date the 27th April last, be read at the usual time of Divine service on the 20th and 27th of this month in all churches and chapels within the cities of London and Westminster, and ten miles thereabout; and upon the 3rd and 10th of June next in all other churches and chapels throughout this kingdom. And it is hereby further ordered that the Right Reverend the Bishops cause the said Declaration to be sent and distributed throughout their several and respective dioceses to be read accordingly."

4. *The Bishops in the Tower.*—It was one thing for the clergy to sorrowfully submit to the calamities the king brought upon them, but quite another to be aiders and abettors of the king in so flagrant a violation of the Constitution as the suspension of a large number of laws without the consent of Parliament. If the laws were intolerant, and the nation desired that they should be

repealed, and the nation's representatives in Parliament gave legal expression to their desires, the clergy would have submitted to the decision without a murmur. But the king was now rushing headlong into a course that the nation abhorred, against the expressed wish of the Parliament; and although the clergy were determined to be loyal to their oath of 'non-resistance,' they would not help the king to break the laws; more especially as they knew his plan to be only an attempt to humiliate them and degrade the Church of England; which had proved to be the only safeguard for the country against Roman and Puritan intolerance. The clergy of London hurriedly assembled to consider this order, and pledged themselves *not to read* the document. Most of the bishops were away on their diocesan duties; but they were hastily summoned by the primate, and six bishops assembled in London under his presidency, the Friday before the fateful Sunday. Having drawn up a respectful petition to the king, 'not to insist upon their distributing and reading a declaration founded on a dispensing power as hath been often declared illegal in Parliament,' they took it to Whitehall the same night (May 18). Archbishop Sancroft was debarred from attending at court, because he had refused to sit upon the High Commission; but the other six bishops—Lake, of Chichester; Trelawney, of Bristol; Ken, of Bath and Wells; White, of Peterborough; Lloyd, of St. Asaph; and Turner, of Ely—were admitted to the presence, and the Bishop of St. Asaph gave the petition to the king. On reading it James exclaimed, "Here are strange words. I did not expect this from the Church of England. This is a standard of rebellion." All the bishops most humbly disclaimed any desire of disloyalty, and Ken said, "I hope your Majesty will grant to us that liberty of conscience



A PROCESSION TO THE TOWER,

said, "I hope your Majesty will grant to us that liberty of conscience

which you propose to grant to all mankind." "I will have my Declaration published," cried the king. "We have two duties to perform; our duty to God, and our duty to your Majesty. We will honour you but we must fear God," replied Trelawney. "I will be obeyed," said James, very angrily, as he dismissed them. "God's will be done," were Ken's parting words. The king's advisers were puzzled what to do next. Not so the bishops and clergy. They had quite made up their minds, and other prelates hastened to add their names to the draught of the petition in sign of their approval. All the eminent Nonconformists, like Baxter and Howe, announced their intention to stand by the bishops and clergy; and when the appointed days arrived not 200 out of all the 10,000 clergy could be found to read the Declaration. At Westminster the congregation hurried away as soon as the reading began; and at Whitehall, because



THE TRAITORS' GATE.

the clergy refused to read it, one of the choristers did so. James was in great fury, and the seven bishops were cited to appear before him in council on Friday, June 8. The news that they were summoned spread like wildfire, as the news of their petition had done, and on the day appointed all the avenues of approach to Whitehall by road and river were thronged with sympathizers. Acting under legal advice the bishops declined to answer the inderminating questions put to them by Jeffreys. They were then told that they would be tried at Westminster for libel, and were bidden to find bail for their appearance. They pleaded the privilege of their peerage, and declined to enter into recognizances. They were therefore committed to the Tower. Their passage down the Thames resembled the triumph of heroes. Crowds lined both banks and shouted, 'God bless your lordships'! Innumerable boats accompanied them, and when they reached the landing stairs at Traitor's Gate the sentinels who received them knelt to ask their blessing. So cheerfully did the bishops bear imprisonment pending their arraignment, and so marked were the enthusiastic demonstrations in their favour from all ranks, that they were soon allowed out on their own recognisances. They had been visited by so many people of rank and influence, during the time they were imprisoned, that it was more convenient to the prison authorities for them to hold such receptions in their own lodgings; especially as they refused to pay any fees to the lieutenant of the Tower.

5. The Trial of the Seven Bishops.—When June 29 arrived the day appointed for the bishops to be tried, half the peers of England showed their friendship by attending the court ; while the streets round Westminster were filled with eager multitudes, determined to do or dare anything if the bishops were condemned. There is a well-known Cornish ballad, composed subsequently for political purposes, which enshrines in its refrain the strong feelings evoked by the trial—

‘And shall Trelawney die ? And shall Trelawney die ?

There’s twenty-thousand Cornish men will know the reason why.’

Portraits of ‘The Seven’ were eagerly bought, and cherished with loving care for many years after. The accusation against the bishops was that they had published a false, malicious and seditious libel. “Counsel for the defence urged that there was no publication, for the petition was placed in the king’s hand ;¹ that the petition was not false, for all that it contained was in the journals of Parliament ; that it was not malicious, for the defendants had not sought to make strife, but had been placed in a situation in which they found themselves by the action of the Government ; that it was not seditious, for it was seen by the king alone ; that it was not a libel, but a decent petition, such as subjects might lawfully present to their king” (*Hale*). There were four judges. Two of them summed up against the bishops, and two in their favour. The jury were locked up all night. Eleven of the twelve soon made up their minds to acquit the prelates, but one obstinate man held out until the morning. He was the king’s brewer, and he feared that a favourable verdict would lose him the royal custom, but as the eleven persuaded him that an adverse verdict would lose him the patronage of the beer-drinking public he was at last won over to their side. The Court re-assembled at 10 a.m. the next day, June 30. The great Hall of Westminster was packed with sympathizers, who listened breathlessly for the verdict. Every arrangement had been made to signal the result of the trial all over the land, and when the foreman of the jury pronounced the magic words ‘NOT GUILTY’ the exultation within and without the hall was unbounded.

“The Bishops urged the people to be still
With outstretched hands and earnest speech in vain !
Yea, many, haply wont to entertain
Small reverence for the mitre’s offices,
And to religion’s self no friendly will,
A prelate’s blessing ask on bended knees.”

The Church of England had never been so dear to the nation as then. Every one who was not a Romanist, whether they were Churchmen,

¹ The petition however had been published ; by whom is not known. Some think the king was privy to its distribution, in order to make a case against the bishops ; others think some clergy were responsible for spreading it broadcast ; but all agree that the bishops had no hand in the publication.



THE SEVEN BISHOPS WHO SAVED ENGLAND, JUNE, 1688.

Presbyterians or Seetaries, thankfully acknowledged that the Bishops had fought for and won the constitutional liberties of England against absolute monarchy; and the freedom of religion from Papal intolerance. The king heard the verdict from a very unpalatable source. He was with his camp at Hounslow, which he formed in 1686 to overawe London, when a great shout of glee was re-echoed again and again by the soldiers. 'What is that noise?' demanded James. 'Oh, nothing,' was the reply, 'they are glad the bishops are acquitted, that's all.' 'So much the worse for them,' the king rejoined. Even the unanimous expression of the nation's opinion could not turn him from his fateful purpose. The Tories now began to modify the doctrine of 'passive obedience,' and came to the conclusion that loyalty to the throne was due to the office, and not the person, of a king; and that extreme oppression on the monarch's part, in defiance of the nation's laws, might justify resistance.

6. The Revolution.—While James had been trying to coerce the nation into Romanism many influential persons had been intriguing with his son in law, the Prince of Orange; some with a view of making him regent, and others in order to make him joint monarch with his wife Mary. On the day of the bishops' acquittal seven influential persons, leaders of both political parties, sent a letter to William inviting him and his army to England. He at once consented, and proceeded to fit out an expedition for the purpose. In the meantime James continued to vex the land. He endeavoured to force the reading of the Declaration by means of the High Commission. Three bishops, hitherto friendly to James, had been made commissioners, but they declined to act any longer. James then brought over Tyreconnel's Irish troops, who were Romanist to a man; for the English soldiers had laid down their pikes rather than sign an engagement which would have bound them to carry out his majesty's popish intentions. Not until the King of France sent warning of the Dutch expedition did James attempt to pause in his insensate career. On September 30th William Prince of Orange issued his declaration that, as husband of Mary, he was coming with an army to uphold the 'Protestant' religion; and to secure a full and legal Parliament by whose decision he would abide. Then, when it was too late James realised his folly, and sought to conciliate the Church. The Bishops advised him to dissolve the High Commission Court, to reinstate the fellows of Magdalen whom he had illegally ejected, to remove the Romanists from the Privy Council, to give up his evil practice of dispensing with the laws, and to call a free Parliament. They also hoped he would give them some occasions to argue with him on the necessity of his return to the Church of England. The first three suggestions were adopted; but James refused to yield his claim to the 'dispensing power,' and he scornfully refused to call a Parliament while the country was threatened with

an invasion. James then wished the clergy to sign a *Declaration of Abhorrence* against William's expedition, but they refused. At the same time they looked coldly on the schemes of the Prince of Orange because his declaration of September 30 made no provision for maintaining the rights and liberties of the English Church, and because of his known preference for Dissent. William sailed from Holland October 19, but was driven back by contrary winds. He sailed again, November 2, with better fortune, and landed at Torbay, November 5. The national dread of papal terrorism will fully




MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

account for the popular rejoicing when it was known that the Prince of Orange had arrived with a fleet of 700 sail, and 16,000 Dutch retainers. No one desired to experience in England a repetition of the massacre of Piedmont, and the troubles of the Huguenots. Evelyn wrote :—' There seems to be a universal design to destroy all that will not go to mass throughout Europe'; and therefore even foreign soldiers, whose antipathy to Romanism was beyond suspicion were hailed as national deliverers. Their advent had the effect of causing all Romanists in office to lay down their commissions, and quit the country; while

the most trusted officers in James' army, with many of the rank and file, and even his daughter Anne, deserted to the hero of the hour.

7. A Lost Cause.—Two months before, the country was surprised to hear that the Queen had given birth to a young prince. So bitter was the hatred against the Romanists of the court that the genuineness of the birth was doubted, even in face of the clearest proofs that James could bring. That child and his descendants became a fruitful source of annoyance to England in after days; but

the history of the Jacobites must be sought elsewhere. The desertion of the officers was followed by the desertion of James' youngest daughter to the insurgents; and the king, feeling that he could trust no one, sought safety in flight. London hastily formed a provisional government, and invited the Prince of Orange; who arrived in London Dec. 19. It was then arranged to call a Convention Parliament, which met January 22, 1689. It contained a majority of Whig Members; and declared that, as James had deserted the nation, the throne should be settled on William and Mary as joint rulers. They laid down the terms on which they were to rule by summing up the illegal acts of James in the *Declaration of Right*; which were subsequently incorporated in the statute called the '*Bill of Rights*.' No one thought of mentioning the young Prince, who was afterwards known as the *Pretender*. William and Mary accepted the Declaration Feb. 13, and were crowned King and Queen. Henceforth the supreme ruler of England became a constitutional monarch, as the servant, not the master of the legislature. The *English Revolution* thus completed had been accomplished without bloodshed, but there were still many people, especially in Scotland and Ireland, who considered that William was an usurper. Before very long James II. obtained sufficient help from the French king, to put himself at the head of Tyrconnel's Irish army. But William sent his Dutchmen over, under Marshall Schomberg, and very soon followed with reinforcements. On July 1, 1690, there was a great battle fought on the banks of the Boyne river. The forces of James were utterly routed, and the supplanted king took refuge once more in France. From that moment the cause of the Stuart kings was lost, although there has never been wanting an heir to its misfortunes. The present representative (1891) of the Jacobite inheritance is Prince Rupert of Bavaria. An obelisk now marks the site of the Battle of the Boyne.




THE BOYNE MONUMENT.

8. The Non-Jurors.—The seven bishops who so bravely withstood the illegal acts of James II. to dispense with twenty acts of

parliament, in order that he might introduce Romanists to high offices in Church and Realm, were not among those who took part in the Revolution. Having sworn to be loyal to King James they remained so; and even when he fled from his post five of the seven preferred to go into retirement rather than take the oath of allegiance to the invading Prince, whom they considered an usurper,—though they would have allowed William to be Regent, according to the suggestion of Charles II., if he would consent to allow all affairs of State to be transacted in the name of James II. In this action they were followed by other bishops and clergy,—notably the bishops of Gloucester, Worcester, and Chester—who preferred suspension and ejection from their benefices rather than renounce allegiance to James, whom alone they held to be the rightful king. These *Non-Jurors* were but a small body of men; hardly five hundred clergy all told, with a corresponding proportion of laymen. Their expulsion from office by the new civil government deprived the Church of many learned, pious, and conscientious members; foremost among whom was the saintly bishop Thomas Ken, of whom, however, it must be said that he declined to follow the rest of his brethren in their efforts to restore the Stuart dynasty. The conscientious scruples of many Non-jurors do not admit of doubt, and their action was but the logical outcome of adherence to the doctrine of hereditary divine right; but this extreme idea of loyalty was detrimental to national liberties; and subversive of the elective character of the English monarchy. The Scriptures command loyalty from all Christians to the powers that be. The Battle of the Boyne convinced the majority of the nation that the Revolution settlement could not be overturned, and it would have been well for the Church had the Nonjurors contented themselves with proving that they had no hand in the change of dynasty. Doctrines of ‘passive obedience’ and ‘non-resistance’ could never justify active and secret conspiracies against the *de facto* government, such as many of the non-jurors acquiesced in, especially after Mary’s death. As the new government had been approved by nineteen twentieths of the nation, the prelates and clergy who thought it right not to transfer their allegiance had no business to separate themselves from their fellow bishops and clergy as they did. They forgot that the Church does not exist for the clergy, but the clergy for the Church; and that the duties of clergymen were never meant to include resistance to a Government that was willing to give them protection in the performance of their spiritual functions. Archbishop Sancroft and others thought themselves justified in keeping up the schism they had made, by calling themselves the true ancient Church; and consecrating bishops to succeed them. After the death of James II., and the recognition of the ‘Pretender’ as King of England by the French, an oath of abjuration was imposed upon the clergy; by which they were required to recognise William as the ‘rightful and

lawful king.' Upon this many who were content to obey the *de facto* government, but could not recognise the Revolution settlement as a *de jure* government, joined the non-juring schism; and it was not until the close of the eighteenth century that the unhappy division so caused came to an end.

9. The Vacillating Clergy.—The Non-jurors were certainly free from any suspicion of interested motives, for they had all to lose and nothing to gain by refusing the oath. Their action was consistent, at any rate, and their firmness brought them many



BRAY CHURCH.

friends. Not so with the majority of the clergy, who did not feel their consciences violated by accepting the new order of things. Such were unceasingly reproached by those who refused to swear, for having allowed pecuniary motives to warp their judgment. In the large majority of cases the taunt was undeserved, but there were many men whose opinions varied with every phase of public opinion. Among them was William Sherlock, master of the Temple, who had been a warm advocate of James II. and joined the Non-jurors, but altered his mind and took the oaths; upon which he obtained high preferment. For this he was reviled by Non-jurors on the one side, and by Revolutionists on the other; while people who cared for neither side cried out against 'turncoats and time-servers.' Those


of whom Sherlock was the type were for many years assailed with satirical lampoons in prose and doggerel verse, of which the well known Jacobite song *The Vicar of Bray* is a fair example. It will be understood that Bray is an assumed name on the songster's part.

When William was our king declared
 To ease the Nation's grievance,
 With this new wind about I steered,
 And swore to him allegiance;

Old principles I did renounce,
 Set conscience at a distance;
 "Passive obedience" was a joke,
 A jest was "non-resistance."

Many clergy must have felt that their conduct was open to such a construction, but it is difficult to see how they could have acted otherwise than they did. It is a matter for devout thankfulness that the Church of England was not drawn into the vortex that overwhelmed the Romanist king James, by a general agreement to the Declaration of Abhorrence which he desired them to make against his son-in-law's invasion. The election of the Prince of Orange was in many ways advantageous to England; and chiefly because, in spite of his known preference for Dissenters, it became impossible for anyone to be monarch of this country who would not uphold the National Church. Ever since the Revolution this has been the case. The Church has been free alike from mediæval superstitions, and from Puritan innovations. *She has kept the mean between the two extremes.* And God has prospered her exceedingly.

GENEALOGICAL TABLE.



PART VI.

The Church of England since the Revolution.

CHAPTER XXVI. (A.D. 1688-1714).

PEACE AND POPULARITY.

Down a swift stream, thus far, a bold design
Have we pursued.
Henceforth, as on the bosom of a stream
That slackens, and spreads wide a watery gleam,
We, nothing loth, a lingering course to measure,
May gather up our thoughts, and mark at leisure
Features that else had vanished like a dream."—*Wordsworth.*

1. The 'Protestant' Succession.—Our business in this concluding part is to set forth some of the important events in English Church history during the last 200 years. It is a very chequered period, in which the Church experienced alternated seasons of calm and storm, wherein also she displayed both unaccountable lethargy and marvellous zeal. It is a period of which most people know something, so that we need not pay strict attention to chronological sequence; and as every one agrees that the connexion between the Church and Realm of England has remained unchanged since the Revolution, we need not dwell so much upon the continuous history of either. Both Whigs and Tories accepted the government of William III. for the sake of the constitutional privileges thereby assured, though the extreme Tories would have preferred not to disturb the Stuart succession. William soon outlived the unpopularity that his Dutch extraction and foreign friends had brought upon him, and before the close of the 17th century he was respected, if not loved, by the majority of the nation; not merely because the connexion with Holland had widened our commercial dealings with European States, but chiefly because his relations to Parliament had made the religious and civil liberties of England safer and more real than ever they were before. The *Bill of Rights* passed in October 1689, containing the terms under which he held the throne from Parliament, added a significant provision to the 'Declaration of Right,' that no Romanist should be eligible to wear the Crown, or be the monarch's consort. The war which William had undertaken

against France, in alliance with other European countries, had increased his popularity; and when a Jacobite plot to murder him was discovered in 1696, a formidable association was formed among the Whigs for his defence, the members of which were pledged to uphold the anti-papal succession alluded to in the 'Bill of Rights.' The war with France seemed to be at an end in 1697; for by the *Peace of Ryswick* Louis XIV. agreed to abandon the Stuart cause and recognize William III. as the only lawful English king, and the Princess Anne for his successor on the throne. Although during William's life constitutional government was safe, the failure of heirs to Queen Mary, and the early deaths of Anne's numerous offspring, made it necessary for Parliament to strengthen the 'Protestant' succession; and therefore an Act of Settlement was passed in 1701 (12 & 13 Wm. III., c. 2), which declared that, in default of heirs to the Princess Anne, the succession should devolve upon Sophia, granddaughter of James I., who had married the Elector of Hanover. This act contained the following distinct provision:—'Whereas it is requisite and necessary that some further provision be made for securing our religious laws and liberties, whoever shall come to the possession of this crown shall join in communion with the Church of England *as by law established*.' This is the basis upon which all subsequent monarchs have accepted the English crown. The foregoing pages will enable the reader to understand that the peculiar and novel phrase 'by law established,' now so much made use of by opponents of the National Church, could not have been intended to mean that the Church had been recently founded; but that the nation, having had temporary experience of numerous ills from modern sects, desired to record its conviction that constitutional liberty and good order could only be secured by a firm adherence to the ancient Church; whose loyalty had been proved through storm and sunshine. The stipulation that the sovereign must be in communion with the Church of England proves that Parliament at that time was quite as anxious to avoid any recurrence of the evils of the Commonwealth, as it was to preserve the land from papal innovations.

2. The Toleration Act.—Soon after the accession of William III. great efforts were made to cement the friendship between Churchmen and Nonconformists, which the national dread of Romanism had brought about. Two bills were laid before Parliament for the purpose, known as the 'Comprehension Bill,' and the 'Toleration Bill.' Had the first been allowed to pass, all the Church's former struggles would have gone for nothing; for it aimed at nothing less than the complete alteration of the liturgy and the *status* of the Church, in order to unite 'their Majesties' Protestant subjects on terms wherein all the reformed Churches agree.' The bill was first introduced into the House of Lords and owing to the

support of William, and the absence of the non-juring archbishop, the peers were persuaded to pass it. The meddlesome cleric, Gilbert Burnet, who had just before been made bishop of Salisbury for his share in the negotiations that brought William to the throne, zealously advocated the measure; especially a proviso in it which would have dispensed with kneeling at the reception of Holy Communion. But when the bill was sent down to the Commons they positively refused to discuss a measure which had for its object the alteration of the doctrine and discipline of the Church, which had never been submitted for the approval of Convocation. As the Parliament of 1689 was only a Convention, Convocation had not been called together. The Comprehension Bill was therefore dropped until there was a new Parliament and a new Convocation, and nothing came of it after all. A better fate was in store for the Toleration Bill, for it readily passed both Houses. The object of it was to exempt all who should take the new oaths of allegiance and supremacy from the penalties imposed upon Nonconformity by previous statutes; but it did not remove the disabilities which prevented them from being admitted to civil offices, nor did it allow them to worship freely after their own fashion, unless their meeting houses were licensed by justices of the peace. Romanist recusants were expressly excluded from the privileges of this act, as were those who denied the doctrine of the Trinity or the Deity of our Saviour. Quakers were allowed by the act to make a solemn affirmation in lieu of the oath. Public opinion as yet was averse to freedom of thought in matters of belief. The laity, as proved by their attitude with respect to the Comprehension Bill, would have considered it a crime to assist in the propagation of what they believed to be error by allowing it to have free course.

Liberty of the Press was closely connected with religious toleration. Hitherto books on geology, medicine, and philosophy had to be licensed by the archbishop of Canterbury, legal works by the lord chancellor, and works on history or politics by a secretary of state. The Act by which these functionaries were made censors was only a temporary measure, renewable at stated periods. When it expired in 1695 it was not renewed; and henceforward freedom of the press has been one of the acknowledged liberties of Englishmen.

3. Religious Societies.¹—The S.P.C.K.—During the reign of Charles II., and owing to the flagrant immorality and profanity that developed so alarmingly after the Restoration, two London clergymen (Dr. Horneck and Mr. Smythies) made a special effort to prevent young Churchmen from straying into vicious paths, by establishing associations under the direction of a clergyman. Their guilds were to be of a strictly devotional character, and their prayers

¹ See *Overten's Life in the English Church, 1660-1714.*

those of the Church of England; but the lay members were not allowed to recite such portions of the liturgy as are directed to be 'pronounced by the priest alone,' like the 'Absolution.' The members met weekly for mutual assistance and consolation, and were bound to consider the wants of the poor; to which end each member brought a weekly contribution according to his means. In the reign of James II., and for fear they might be used to promote Romanism, these societies began to be suspected; though without reason, for they proceeded to still more zealous works of piety and love. "When they saw the Mass celebrated daily in the chapels royal and elsewhere, they resolved, in a spirit of laudable emulation, to set up daily prayers at 8 in the evening at St. Clement Danes in



OFFICES OF THE S.P.C.K., NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

the Strand; where they never wanted a full and affectionate congregation. Their earnest anxiety to guard themselves from declension in religion secured their frequent reception of the Holy Communion, and their carefulness to receive it with unimpaired reverence induced them to set forth preparation lectures on the Sunday and Friday preceding its administration at many churches in town; and, not content with receiving the sacrament upon the holy days of the Church, they were in the habit of meeting at one another's houses on the nights or evenings preceding, in order to discourse piously upon the subject matter of the day."¹ One of the

1 Secretan's Life of Robert Nelson.

leaders of these societies was *Robert Nelson*, son of a London merchant, who, although he retired temporarily with the Non-jurors, soon returned to active work among his friends ; and in his 'Companion for the Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England : with collects and prayers for each solemnity,'¹ we are able to read the very words in which some of their meetings were conducted. Many people thought that these societies might lead to schism, and envious people endeavoured to suppress them ; though without effect until they came to be accused of Jacobite tendencies, and wrongly confused with the *Societies for the Reformation of Manners*. The latter were vigilance societies, founded to suppress vice by the legal prosecution of offenders against the moral code. Indeed many of the members were magistrates and lawyers, who felt called upon by the growing impunity of vice, encouraged in high places, to take special action ; and there seems reason to suppose that they did much to stem the tide of blasphemy and licentiousness which was then so high. It is not too much to say that the religious troubles of the 17th century had been due to a want of accurate knowledge respecting the dogmatic teaching of the Church of England. Individual effort was powerless to dispel this baneful cause ; but just before the close of the 17th century a means was provided by which it could be lessened. Out of the devotional societies there sprang a permanent Institution, now well known as the S.P.C.K. It was founded May 8, 1698, by a clergyman named Dr. Bray, and four communicant laymen—Lord Guildford, Sir H. Mackworth, Justice Hook and Colonel Colchester—who agreed to meet and consult as often as convenient, 'under the conduct of the Divine providence and assistance to promote Christian knowledge.' The Society soon increased in numbers, Robert Nelson being among the first to join, and developed its working powers, both at home and abroad, by establishing elementary day schools for poor children, ministering to the sick and dying in the hospitals, establishing evening schools for illiterate adults, reclaiming the criminal classes, producing theological treatises, publishing religious tracts and healthy story-books ; endeavouring to promote the unity of Christendom, and supplying religious ministrations to the moving multitudes of soldiers, sailors and emigrants ; besides sending the gospel message to our Colonists and their heathen neighbours. In 1705 it began to circulate Bibles and Prayer-books at a cheap rate throughout the country ; a work which it has continued ever since, and greatly developed. In 1709 it issued the Prayer-book in Welsh, and a Welsh translation of the Bible nine years later ; since when it has been actively engaged in supplying vernacular versions of the Scriptures and Liturgy to assist the missionaries in foreign lands.² In recent years the various depart-

1 Still published by the S.P.C.K., 4s.


2 For a list of the foreign literature of the Church published by the Society at the present day see the "Official Year Book of the Church of England, 1888."

ments of its work have greatly increased in magnitude, until its influence is felt throughout the world—in every English parish, every colonial diocese, and every foreign missionary station. It is the firstborn of many Societies which (upon the principle of UNION, wherein is strength) have done for the Church of England in particular, and the cause of Christianity in general, invaluable service. Over and over again its work has grown so far in excess of its capacity and original intentions, that new Societies have sprung from it to undertake special departments. The *Charity Schools* of the 18th century, a very exceptional means of education until the S.P.C.K. made their cause its own, were for a long time the chief means by which the rudiments of scholarship were imparted to the children of the poor. In 1704 there were 54 charity schools in and about London, and one of the most pleasing sights of that time was to see three and four thousands of the little ones, uniformly and cleanly attired, assembled in some great church for their anniversary service. They may be considered as the forerunners of our National Schools (see page 255), and before the 19th century dawned they had increased to 500.

4. Church Work Abroad¹—The S.P.G.—Every year the colonies were opening out new fields for the development of British enterprise and British trade; and it became a very important question as to how those engaged in such trade could be provided with religious ministrations. We have seen that Virginia became a colony for Church people, and that the Puritans peopled New England, in the days of James I. Maryland became a Roman Catholic colony in 1633; and Oliver Cromwell acquired Jamaica for this country in 1655. The Hudson's Bay Company was chartered in 1671 to trade with the Indians in Prince Rupert's Land; and the Quakers founded Pennsylvania in 1682. Meanwhile the East India Company had so greatly increased its possessions that a new company was founded in 1698; but these were united ten years later. The Virginian colonists had all along maintained a few resident clergy; the Long Parliament had subsidised the New England missions among the North American Indians; and in the year 1662 the spirit of missionary enterprise was accepted by the Church of England, when it inserted in the Liturgy 'The Prayer for all Conditions of men' that God would be pleased to make known his saving health unto all nations. The *Hon. Robert Boyle*, a director of the East India Company, had done much to induce that Corporation to recognise its spiritual obligations; and had even offered to lead a party of evangelists to New England, which he was prevented from doing. Just before his death in 1691 he made provision at his own cost for the annual delivery of lectures on Christian Evidences, which

¹ See Tucker's *English Church in other lands*. Longmans, 2s. 6d.

should prove the Christian religion against Atheists, Theists, Pagans, Jews, and Mahometans; and be assisting to all companies and encouraging them in any undertakings for propagating the Christian religion in foreign parts.' The same beneficent layman bequeathed the residue of his estate to the still-flourishing 'Christian Faith Society for the advancement of the Christian religion amongst infidels in Virginia'; the revenues of which are now applied to missions in the West Indies. At that time no one ever thought of colonial or missionary bishops, and by an order in Council, which dated from the reign of Charles II., all Churchmen abroad were



THE OLD EAST INDIA HOUSE.

placed under the episcopal direction of the Bishop of London, who, in 1696, appointed the indefatigable Dr. Bray as his commissary to Maryland 'to model that infant Church.' It was on Dr. Bray's return from a first inspection of affairs there that he set about the formation of the S.P.C.K.; and one of the first resolutions that society had laid before it was his 'scheme for promoting religion in the plantations.' Knowing that the clergy who went abroad 'were likely to be of the poorer sort,' he started a fund for printing and circulating suitable books among them (1697), a plan which was at once applied to the necessities of the home clergy as well; and which developed into parochial lending libraries throughout Great Britain,

through the instrumentality of a Society which still exists under the title of the 'Associates of Dr. Bray.' In 1699 Dr. Bray went again to Maryland, and returned in 1701; only to find the work of the S.P.C.K. had far outgrown its ability, or rather that its constitution was not adapted for missionary propaganda. At his suggestion, therefore, Convocation enquired into the necessities of Christianity beyond the seas; and moved Archbishop Tenison to obtain from the Crown a charter for the incorporation of the *Society*

for the *Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, otherwise the 'S.P.G.', which should relieve the S.P.C.K. of the necessity of sending human instruments abroad; though the latter Society still continued to be responsible for providing educational machinery, as it is to this day. The active work of the S.P.G. commenced June 16, 1701; when it arranged for missions among the English traders at Archangel and Moscow; following this up by sending clergy to America in 1702, and Newfoundland in 1703. 'From the first, it aimed at the conversion of the pagans as well as the benefit of Christian emigrants and colonists; but its income was very limited, never exceeding £6,000 in any year of the first century of its existence.' Several attempts were made to found an American bishopric in the early part of the 18th century; but the difficulties seemed so insuperable that the projects fell through (see page 268). The income of the S.P.G. now exceeds £100,000 annually, and it employs (1891) 672 clergy in every quarter of the globe, 162 of whom are natives of the districts where they labour.


5. The Scotch Church Supplanted.—The devotion of the Scotch Church to the Stuart cause caused William III. to look upon it with disfavour, especially as his own sympathies were with the Presbyterians. The Cameronians were the first to proclaim the Prince of Orange as King of Scotland, which was an additional reason for his friendship with the Covenanters. The Scotch Convention which met in 1689, offered the crown of Scotland to William and Mary on much the same terms as the English had done; but their Declaration of Right contained the additional clause, that 'Prelacy was a great and insupportable grievance'; and the last clause of the coronation oath which the Scotch commissioners tendered to them bound the new rulers 'to root out all heretics and enemies to the true worship of God.' *i.e.* according to the covenant. William III. objected to this and said, "I will not lay myself under any obligation to be a persecutor;" though when the commissioners assured him that this was not required, both he and Mary took the oath. But in the meantime the whole of the Lowlands presented a wild scene of mob violence. The Presbyterians shewed themselves more intolerant than ever by forcibly ejecting ('rabbling' they called it) the episcopal clergy, oftentimes with bloodshed; and it was with difficulty that order could be restored. In July, 1702, the Scotch Convention formally disestablished Scotch Episcopacy, and appropriated to Presbyterian uses all the old churches of Scotland, together with the tithes and revenues that had hitherto belonged to the Episcopal Church, which have ever since remained in the possession of the Presbyterian body. Although William III. assented to this act he desired a general toleration throughout Scotland for all other religious communities except the Romanists, but this the Scottish Parliament refused to allow. Many of the Scottish gentry who were

also Episcopalian, had fled to the highlands and raised the standard of James against William ; and stern measures were adopted by the latter to repress the rising. Excuse it how men will the written order "to extirpate Maclan of Glencoe and his tribe," superscribed and countersigned by William III. must ever remain a stain upon his character. Secretly, and under the guise of friendship, a party of William's troops under Captain Campbell obtained hospitality with the clan thus devoted to the sword ; and after a sojourn of fifteen days, during which they received much kindness and civility, the guests fell upon their entertainers in the grey dawn of a wintry day Feb. 13, 1692, and put them to the sword.

'The hand that mingled in the meal,
At midnight drew the felon's steel.'

For the rest of William's reign Scotland was comparatively tranquil ; but in 1703, when the Princess Anne had succeeded William on the English throne, there was again considerable trouble ; caused chiefly by the 'Act of Security,' which corresponded with the English Act of Settlement. That there should be no misunderstanding, the Scottish Parliament made a solemn declaration that Presbyterianism was the only true Church ; and refused consent for the successors of Queen Anne to succeed to the Scottish throne unless securities were given for the Presbyterian religion, and for an equitable share in commercial privileges. This became Scottish law in 1704, Queen Anne being induced to give her assent in order to bring about the union of the kingdoms ;

for although one monarch had reigned over the whole of Britain, ever since James I. ascended the English throne, Scotland and England were distinct kingdoms with separate legislatures. The union of the kingdoms was brought about in 1706, though not without great opposition from the Scots ; who had all



THE OLD CHURCH, PERTH (*see page 107*).

to lose, and little to gain, as they thought. There was a natural objection to the surrender of national independence to a kingdom which they had resisted for centuries; and the trading classes feared that they would lose advantages when Edinburgh should cease to be a capital. The Jacobites foresaw the certain ruin of the Stuart cause; and the Covenanters feared the possible loss of Presbyterianism. English Churchmen, too, were in no mind to ally themselves again with a Presbyterian body. The religious difficulty was got over by the understanding that, although there should be only one state—with a legislative body in London to which the Scotch should send a given number of representatives—there should be no changes made in either national Church. The Act of Union on these terms passed the English Parliament in 1707; and a new national flag was formed by a conjunction of the crosses of St. Andrew and St. George. When, later on, Ireland was united with England the red cross of St. Patrick was laid upon the white cross of St. Andrew, and this is known as the *Union Jack*. The Scotch Episcopal Church continued to be down-trodden for many years, though recently it has wonderfully revived. A difficulty had arisen in 1689 as to the patronage of the established Presbyterian Churches; because the patrons were chiefly the landed gentry, who were for the most part Episcopalians; they were therefore deprived of their rights as patrons. These rights were restored to them in 1712, but great ill-feeling resulted between different parties in the Presbyterian Church; which grew in intensity as years rolled by, and led to the great secession from the Established Kirk in 1843, when the Free Kirkers who came out set up a Church of their own. An attempt was made to heal the breach in 1874, when the ancient patronage was transferred once more to the male communicants of each congregation, but the Free Kirkers seemed to be in no mind to return whence they came out, and therefore the schism continues.

6. Queen Anne's Bounty.—Speaking generally, the clergy of Queen Anne's reign were exceedingly poor. The value of many benefices had been little more than nominal since the dissolution of monasteries, and consequent permanent alienation of rectorial tithes, had deprived them of the major part of their ancient endowments. We have referred (pages 30 and 83) to the appropriation by the Crown of the annates and first fruits; the payment of which still further impoverished the incumbents. More than half the benefices were of less value than £100 a year; and as the first fruits and tenths amounted in the aggregate to more than £16,000 a year, it was a very considerable tax. Queen Anne was most anxious to show her hearty acceptance of the spirit of her coronation oath by liberally patronising all Church work. Bishop Burnet deserves the credit of having persuaded her to accede to the tardy act of justice by which the first fruits and tenths, though still obliged to be paid,

might be transferred to a common fund, administered by Churchmen for the benefit of poor livings. In the exuberance of their gratitude the fund was called by Churchmen *Queen Anne's Bounty*: it having been announced that she had acceded to the measure in celebration of her birthday (Feb. 6, 1704). But there was an immediate benefit to the clergy by the further announcement that all arrears should be remitted. The fund so raised has been greatly added to by private munificence since Queen Anne's day—*e.g.* In the Church of Ellen-hall, there is a memorial tablet which states that—'Mr. John Webb by his will gave the sum of £500 to the governors of Queen Anne's bounty, the interest thereof to be paid half-yearly to the perpetual curate for ever in augmentation of his income' Those who desire to benefit others after their own decease, infinitely prefer to place their donations in the safe keeping of some respectable corporation which is willing to act as their trustee. Q.A.B. holds four and a half millions of such trust money. Queen Anne did not give anything to the Church out of her private purse or the public funds; nor does Parliament grant to the monarch any indemnity for surrendering the right to what was considered a succession duty upon livings as some have erroneously stated; because, to take the act passed at the accession of our Queen Victoria as an example, which fixes Her Majesty's private income, there is not a single word said about any money being granted in consideration of the surrender of the first fruits and tenths.

7. The Impeachment of Sacheverell.—Queen Anne's reign is noted for the rise of party government in civil affairs. Previously, it had been the custom for the monarch to choose chief advisers from Whigs as well as Tories, though there might be a majority of one or the other; but it now became customary for the ministry to be selected from one party only, while the other party formed the opposition; as it is to this day. All the Tories were Church people, as indeed were most of the Whigs; but as the latter were more inclined to favour toleration of Dissent, the Nonconformists joined their party. Bishop Burnet tells us also that the party names 'High Church' and 'Low Church' came into use at the same time; but his explanation of the differences between them shews also that High Church was synonymous with 'Tory,' and that Low Church meant the same as 'Whig.' Queen Anne's first government was chiefly Whig, and became entirely so; its leading spirit being the great and victorious general the *Duke of Marlborough*; who exercised despotic sway over the conscience of the queen by means of his wife. But another lady, Abigail Hill, who belonged to the Tory party, managed to supplant the Duchess of Marlborough in the councils of the queen; and moved the latter to show more favour to the Tory party. Newspapers were not then allowed to report Parliamentary debates, and public opinion was formed by pam-

phleteers and political parsons. The great Whig pamphleteer was *Daniel Defoe*, the author of 'Robinson Crusoe'; and his rival in the Tory interest was *Jonathan Swift*, the Dean of St. Patrick's, and author of 'Gulliver's Travels.' These spent their time in satirising public men and events of the day. Bishop Burnet constantly preached political sermons in the Whig interest; and on the other hand, a chaplain of St. Saviour's Priory, *Dr. Henry Sacheverell*, tried his hand in abusing the Whig government in his pulpit utterances. He preached a violent sermon before the Lord Mayor from the text, "In perils among false brethren," and another in Derby, at the assizes; both of which roundly denounced the government, much to the delight of the Tories, who published the sermons, and scattered them broadcast, with a view of influencing the coming elections. The angry Whigs impeached the doctor before the House of Lords, and a great state trial was the result.

'High' and 'Low,'

Watchwords of party, on all tongues were rife;
As if a Church, though sprung from Heaven, must owe
To opposites and fierce extremes, her life—
Not to the golden mean, and quiet flow
Of truths that soften hatred, temper strife.—*Wordsworth*.

Public opinion was all in favour of Sacheverell, and even the queen did not disguise her sympathy with him; for she went down daily to the trial in her sedan chair, along side which the people ran and shouted, 'Sacheverell and High Church! we hope your Majesty is for Dr. Sacheverell.' The court condemned him to suspension from his benefice for three years, and his sermons to be burned by the common hangman. This comparatively mild sentence after three weeks' trial was received with unbounded glee by the multitudes, because it was a virtual triumph for the Tories. But the mob were not satisfied with their 'moral victory.' They had been reading Dean Swift's clever satires on Whig appointments to bishoprics, and really thought that the Church was in great danger from the evident sympathy of the Government with Nonconformity. The mob manifested its glee in a very barbarous and unjustifiable way. Not satisfied with lighting bonfires all over London, they attacked the meeting houses of Dissenters and pulled out the seats to replenish the flames; while the Guards who were called out to quell the riots, refused to disperse the mob. Sacheverell was now loaded with honours and preferments; and his progress through the country to take possession of them was made the occasion for political demonstrations in his favour. Queen Anne then dissolved Parliament, and writs were issued for a general election. The Tory candidates were nearly everywhere victorious, and the Marlborough faction was ousted from the Government. This was the only incident of note during Queen Anne's reign in which civil

affairs were affected by the action of the clergy ; but it sufficed to bring the Church a greater measure of prosperity than it had known for centuries.

8. Popularity of the Church.— Canon Overton says : ‘ nothing marks more strongly the popularity of the Church at this period than the evident fact that no one had the least chance of a hearing unless he professed a friendship for, or at least no hostility to her. Those who were her bitterest enemies assumed an apologetical tone.’ And again : ‘ The fact is, that though it is exceedingly



ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.

doubtful whether the State was of much use to the Church, there is no doubt that the Church was of very great use to the State ; it was a name to conjure with, and it was used accordingly.¹ But the popularity of the Church shewed itself in various other ways, and notably in the restoration and rebuilding of the churches which had been so sadly devastated during the Commonwealth. But all work of

¹ *Life in the English Church*, Longmans, 14/- . A recent work which throws much light upon the human interest of this important period of Church History.

this kind faded into insignificance compared with the rebuilding of St. Paul's Cathedral. The foundation stone had been laid June 21, 1675; and the choir opened for worship in 1697; but the nave and transepts were not completed until several years after, while the top stone was not affixed until 1710. We regret to say that, in the reign of William III., Sir Christopher Wren was first put on half pay, and then dismissed from his post of surveyor, because people considered that the work progressed too slowly. The great dome of St. Paul's is somewhat of a deception. There are in fact two domes, an inner and an outer. The central lantern and spire which we see from the outside does not appear to be supported by either; but by a stone cone of masonry between the domes which rises from the lower storey of the drum. St. Paul's Cathedral is a kind of pantheon for the heroes of England, and among the greatest of those buried there is the master architect himself. There is no gorgeous mausolcum erected to his memory, but only a simple tablet on the portico of the north transept, bidding those who desire a monument for Wren to 'look around.' The consecration of St. Paul's Cathedral was a very grand function indeed; it occurred soon after Sacheverell's impeachment, and the queen went in great state to the ceremony. Her statue has been lately re-erected outside its western front in recognition of her interest in the work. The total cost of St. Paul's Cathedral was £747,661 10s. 5d. In 1711 an Act was passed by the new Tory government (9 Anne, c. 1) making provision for the building of fifty-two 'new churches in or near the populous cities of London and Westminster and the suburbs thereof.' The needful funds were to be provided out of the city coal dues as before (see page 172) and they were all to be built within a given time; but for some unexplained reason the project collapsed, for only twelve were built, and three or four others repaired, in spite of the fact that the time limited for their building had been considerably extended. The style in which the twelve were built was very like that of Wren, though he was too old at the time to take an active part in the work. St. Mary-le-Strand, and St. Martin's in the Fields at Charing Cross, may be taken as examples of the churches erected under this Act, but although the coal dues were in part appropriated towards their edification, private munificence had a very considerable share in their adornment.

9. Hardships of Nonconformity.—A state paper published in the early part of the reign of William III. estimates the religious divisions of the population thus: Church people 4,954,508; Dissenters 217,152; and Romanists 27,712. In Queen Anne's reign the proportion of Nonconformists could not have been much more. One of the first measures introduced in Parliament on the accession of Queen Anne was the 'Occasional Conformity Bill.' The Test Act (page 174) prevented anyone holding positions under the Crown

unless they received the Holy Communion at stated periods. It soon became known that many civil servants qualified themselves for office by fulfilling the strict letter of the Test Act, but infringed its spirit by attending Dissenting meeting houses at all other times. These were called 'occasional conformists,' and were much disliked by the extreme Tories. The Occasional Conformity Bill proposed to inflict heavy fines on such double dealing. It passed through the House of Commons in 1702, but the Lords so altered its provisions that it fell through. The next year it was again introduced in the Commons but rejected in the Lords. In 1704 it was again brought forward and the Commons incorporated it with the Bill of Supply which the House of Lords could not alter. This was declared an illegal method of silencing the legislative functions of the House of Peers; and caused the measure to lose ground in the country, until the affair of Sacheverell gave Tories a majority in Parliament. In 1711 the Bill was again introduced in an altered form, and under a new name, when it passed almost without opposition. Two years later there was another general election on account of the war which the Tories had brought to an end; and with the result that a large minority of Whig members were returned. In May 1714 the *Schism Act* was submitted to this new Parliament and passed the Commons by a majority of 276 against 126 votes, although it only obtained acceptance in the Lords by the narrow majority of 3. It forbade the keeping of public or private schools by any persons who refused to conform to the National Church or failed to obtain license from the bishop of the diocese in which the school was situated; but no licenses were to be granted by the bishops unless the applicants could show that they had fulfilled the provisions of the Test Act. This would have put an end to Nonconformist schools, but happily it was never put in force; for Anne died on the very day that it was to take effect (August 1, 1714). Both the Occasional Conformity Bill and the Schism Act were repealed Feb. 18, 1719. Daniel Defoe travestied the Tory policy with such verisimilitude in his 'Shortest Way with the Dissenters' that it was at first accepted with enthusiasm; but when he published a key to the satire, and the Tories found how artfully they were entrapped, the writer was pilloried for sedition and put in prison. But he was released the next year. Defoe's pamphlet is really an argument in favour of complete toleration; for he also attacks his own friends the Dissenters, because when they had the power they did not respect their opponents. Now, 'like the cock in the stable, they are quite willing to propose to the horses let us all keep our legs quiet.'¹ It was perhaps to be expected that the Nonconformists would be despised while the Church was in high favour; but we should be careful not to test the customs of those times by the standard of our own day, either

¹ Morris's *Age of Anne*, Longmans, 25.6d

with respect to the relative positions and treatment of Nonconformists and Churchgoers, or with reference to the disorderly habits which are reported of those who were most regular in their attendance at Church.

10. Pews in Churches. It is to be feared that the Church people were too much absorbed in the political questions of the day to pay much regard to reverent behaviour in Divine worship. It was a common practice for men to wear their hats in church, though for the matter of that they wore them everywhere until powdered wigs came in vogue. The excessive levity of the Court ladies during service time provoked the ire of Bishop Burnet. His complaint to Queen Anne was thus transposed by a satirist :

‘ Then pray condescend such disorders to end,
And to the ripe vineyard the labourers send,
To build up the seats : that the beauties may see,
The face of no brawling pretender but me.’

Here is an obvious reference to the high pews which had then become fashionable. The well-to-do had appropriated privileged enclosures to themselves and their families in the parish churches, just as others now do when they lease portions of the Albert Hall. They would fit up their pew or their gallery in the most approved style of upholstery and wood carving, whilst the poor had to make shift with the meanest accommodation. By the end of the 18th century there was scarcely a parish church throughout the land which did not contain one or more of these family pews, the tallest and most elegantly fitted being reserved for the most notable residents ; while even the churchwardens had their stately pen, where they could obtain an uninterrupted view of the garishly gilt inscription which told that the edifice had been repaired and beautified—*i.e.*, white-washed and made hideous—during their tenure of office. Many of these pews continued so long in the possession of certain families or occupants of manor houses, that it was supposed they were held by prescriptive right ; and faculties were granted by the diocesan registrars which made it almost impossible to dispossess the holders. Although the rich were eager to claim for themselves a share in the misappropriation of the area of the parish churches, they were by no means so eager to occupy the space allotted for their use ; and woe betide any poor creature who trespassed upon their preserves. Sir Christopher Wren much desired that there should be no pews in the churches that he built ; but he records ‘there is no stemming the tide of profit of pew keepers especially since by pews in the chapels of ease the minister is chiefly supported.’ And when the scheme of building fifty-two new churches was started, he was almost pathetic in his protest that, ‘a church should not be so filled with

PULPIT AND PEW, *temp.* QUEEN ANNE.

pews, but that the poor may have room to stand and sit in the alleys, for to them equally is the gospel preached.' The idea that the tenancy of particular houses in a parish includes the right to have reserved pews in its church has now become exploded; and it is much more in accordance with the spirit of Christianity that there should be no distinction of persons 'within the Church's gate.' At any rate men should not be allowed to parade their superior dignity and larger possessions by occupying seats which, while distinguishing them, obscure the poor man's vision. Happily these are now nearly all done away.

CHAPTER XXVII. (A.D. 1714-1830).

THE GEORGIAN ERA.

"As to the sandy desert fountains are,
With palm-groves shaded at wide intervals;
Such to this British isle her Christian fanes,
Each linked to each for kindred services; . . .
Where a few villagers on bended knees
Find solace which a busy world disdains."—*Wordsworth*

1. **The Silencing of Convocation.**—Reference was made on page 197 to the Comprehension Bill, which failed to obtain a hearing in the House of Commons because it had not been previously submitted to the Church's legislative body of Convocation. William III. admitted the mistake, and hastened to complete the representation of the

English constitution by summoning Convocation to debate the measure. It is customary on the assembling of the Church's legislature, as in Parliament, for the members to vote a loyal address to the king in reply to his summons. The Upper House of Convocation was then lacking in dignity and influence owing to the absence of the Non-juring bishops; and when it had drawn up the address the Lower House refused to adopt some of its phrases, especially one which gave the title of 'Protestant' to the Church of England, as though she were on a par with the foreign and Presbyterian communities which had broken away from Catholic traditions and appropriated to themselves that distinguishing prefix. The Bishops were obliged to yield the point, though there ensued a very unedifying conflict between the Upper and Lower Houses for a long time. When the comprehension scheme was submitted to the Lower House they declined to have anything to do with it on the ground that the Church of England needed no alteration, whereupon, through the influence of Dr. Tillotson, whom William III. had marked out to succeed Sancroft in the primacy, Convocation was prorogued, and not allowed to meet again while Tillotson ruled. There can be no doubt that the action of the Lower House of Convocation saved the Church of England and her formularies from being stultified and mutilated. Had the proposed comprehension scheme been agreed to there would have been a most lamentable separation from the Church on the part of those who appreciated apostolic doctrine and fellowship, which must have increased the number of Non-jurors and shaken the constitutional foundation which we now owe to the Revolution. It was not until 1701 that Convocation met again, and in the interval there was much controversy respecting the privileges of the Lower House; the proctors claiming that they stood in the same relations to the Upper House as the House of Commons did to the House of Lords. Dr. Tenison had succeeded Tillotson as archbishop of Canterbury, and there was unseemly strife between him and the proctors because he claimed to have a right of proroguing the Lower House, which they denied on the ground that the Lord Chancellor cannot prorogue the House of Commons. In Queen Anne's time the disputes between the Upper and the Lower Houses increased, owing to the fact that the majority of the bishops had been nominated for their sympathies with the Whig interest and favoured the Dissenters; whence arose the cry of 'the Church in danger,' that increased to a roar when Sacheverell was impeached. About the same time one Dr. Hoadley gave utterance in his sermons to what were considered startling opinions, which helped to increase the fears of the Lower House; because the bishops made no attempt to inhibit him from preaching. He was an extreme advocate of what is called Latitudinarianism, which favoured or palliated anti-Christian and infidel opinions. Continual prorogations of Convocation prevented any official condemnation of these opinions; and Hoadley became the champion of

the Whigs as Sacheverell had been of the Tories, because he boldly denounced the divine right of kings through which the Jacobites were striving to restore the Stnarts to the throne. In 1714 the Whigs came into office again, and soon after Hoadley was made bishop of Bangor; from which official position he published a book which denied the value of episcopacy, and the need of any particular form of belief, which was followed up by a sermon that denied the existence of a visible Church. Anything more disgraceful, coming from a man who accepted high office and emolument in a Church which held that the tenets he denied were of vital necessity, could not well be conceived. High Church and Low Church agreed in denouncing the heretical bishop, but the government which appointed him was determined to uphold their nominee at all costs. When Convocation met in May 1717 the Lower House unanimously censured Hoadley's writings, whereupon the government prorogued Convocation before the Upper House had time to confirm the censure; and refused to allow it to meet again for the despatch of business. Henceforward, and until the year 1850, although Convocation was formally called together when new Parliaments were elected, it was not allowed to exercise its undoubted right of promoting legislation for the needs of the Church of England. To this arbitrary interference with her ancient prerogatives—for the Church's right to assemble in Council is older by centuries than the English Parliament—may be traced the greater part of the troubles that afterwards came upon her. As Canon Perry pointedly states: "The Church, denied the power of expressing her wants and grievances, and of that assertion of herself in her corporate capacity which the constitution had provided for her, was assailed at their will by unscrupulous ministers of the Crown, and feebly defended by Latitudinarian bishops in an uncongenial assembly. Her ministers might now give utterance to the most heretical, and even blasphemous teaching, without fear of censure, and there remained no agency for altering and adjusting her system to meet the varying requirements and opportunities of the times."

2. Calm in the Church.—Queen Anne had died in 1714; and although she had been anxious that her half brother, whom Mary of Modena had borne to James II., should succeed her on the throne, the fear the nation had of Jesuitry made it imperative for the government to proclaim the son of the Electress Sophia as king, and that was why the Lutheran prince, George I., a foreigner by birth and speech, ascended the throne without opposition, thus introducing a new line of kings. Though we may regard his succession with satisfaction, when we consider that it saved our land from a restoration of papal errors and intolerance, it cannot be denied that the

Church of England had to suffer a long period of neglect as part of the bargain. The four Georges reigned for 115 years, during which period the life of the Church seemed paralysed. George I. inaugurated an era of peace, during which the temporal welfare of the nation progressed very rapidly, but his immoral private life set an ill example to society at large; and the silencing of Convocation shewed that Church life was not likely to be advanced by those whom he placed at the head of civil affairs. The Georgian era has been termed the *siesta* of the English Church, but that is a very mild way of putting it. It was a period of indifference and apathy,



STOKE-POGES CHURCH, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

say what men will to the contrary; although no doubt the spiritual darkness of the time was often relieved by brilliant gleams of light which have not yet ceased to shine. The life of the town was very unsatisfactory; but in the seclusion of country villages there lived many an earnest parish priest who endeavoured by speech and pen and pious example to stem the torrent of vice and irreligion. There were many non-juring clergy also who, though unable actively to do their part, were unfailing in their attendance day by day at the services in their parish churches, whose saintly life amid distracting surroundings did more good than sermons. Foremost among them we must reckon *William Law*, who, though in latter life a disciple of German mysticism, has wrought a strong influence

upon the religious thought of succeeding generations, chiefly by means of his 'Serious Call to a devout and holy life,' which was published in 1726.¹ He also remorselessly exposed the audacities of Bishop Hoadley, and with such remarkable incisiveness that Hoadley made no attempt to answer his repeated challenges. No more remarkable illustration of the unassuming influence diffused by the Church, in quiet country districts, can be found than the circumstances which inspired the poet Gray, when staying at Stoke-Poges, to write his famous *Elegy*; which still retains its power to revive pleasant and pensive associations. It appeals to the capacity of childhood no less than to the universal instinct of humanity; and imparts a permanent charm to the most commonplace sentiments. We should hardly think as he did were we to visit this spot without knowing what he wrote; but we are surprised, after reading and seeing, that the thoughts did not arise in our own minds. There is one verse specially suited to our present purpose.

"Hark! how the sacred calm that breathes around,
Bids every fierce tumultuous passion cease;
In still small accents whispering from the ground
A grateful earnest of eternal peace."

This was published in the middle of the 18th century, and it may serve to indicate, in better words than we can frame, the underlying influences for good, unconsciously diffused by the Church in the period of its greatest apathy. Oliver Goldsmith also, some twenty years later, in his poem of the *Deserted Village* (after a careful study of the country during several years for the express purpose), forcibly sums up the unassuming yet invaluable lives of the country parsons that he met.

"Thus to relieve the wretched was his pride,
And e'en his failings leaned to virtue's side;
But in his duty prompt at every call,
He watched and wept, he prayed and felt for all;
And, as a bird each fond endearment tries,
To tempt its new-fledged offspring to the skies,
He tried each art, reproved each dull delay,
Allured to brighter worlds, and led the way."


In the busier life of court and society *George Berkeley* occupies a foremost place among the clergy. He was an Irishman, and owed his reception in the world of letters to Dean Swift. He was also a philosopher, and possessed of great conversational powers. He obtained the deanery of Derry in 1724, and the bishopric of Cloyne in 1733. He conceived an idea of evangelising the American Indians by establishing a missionary college on the Island of Bermuda; and so persuaded the members of the legislature of its

¹ Recently reprinted by Griffith & Farran. Price 1s.

necessity, that the House of Commons voted him £20,000 for the purpose. On the faith of this he embarked with his wife for America, and lived temporarily at Rhode Island; where he matured his plans, and waited for the money, which never came. He had, therefore, to return, grievously disappointed at the failure of his plan. Although his fanciful schemes were thwarted at the time by Sir Robert Walpole, then Prime Minister, who seems to have been determined to extinguish every kind of religious activity; posterity has endorsed Berkeley's forecast of America's future greatness:—

“ Westward the course of empire takes its way :
The first four acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama of the day :
Time's noblest offspring is its last.”

3. Growth of Infidelity.—In the year 1707 the Socinians who denied the divinity of our Lord and the doctrine of the Holy Trinity



BISHOP BUTLER.

were sufficiently numerous to form themselves into the distinct religious community henceforth known as *Unitarians*. They were chiefly drawn from the English Presbyterians, and were closely allied with the English Deists; whose chief exponent was Dr. Samuel Clark, a Church of England clergyman who had adopted Latitudinarian views, and who, though he had retracted some of his earlier writings while Convocation was allowed to deliberate, plunged into heretical tenets, after its suspension preserved him from fear of censure. At this time sceptical works were issued from the press in great numbers, bearing the names of Hume, Bolingbroke, Tindal, Collins, Woolston, and a host besides;

who followed in the steps of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, Hobbes, Toland, and Shaftesbury. They were replied to by Warburton, Waterland, Sherlock, Berkeley, Horne, Leland, and many more, who had taken up the work of Christian Evidences in succession to bishop Bull, John Locke, Ralph Cudworth, Richard Cumberland, etc. But the most doughty champion of orthodoxy was *Joseph Butler*, who became bishop of Bristol in 1738, and afterwards Bishop of Durham; which latter see he declined to vacate when offered the archbishopric of Canterbury. Two years before his

elevation to the episcopate he had published his great work, 'the *Analogy of Religion*, natural and revealed, to the constitution and course of nature'; which has ever since held a foremost place in the intellectual armoury from whence theologians select their weapons against the champions of unbelief. He thus states the circumstances which led him to compose the book: "It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And accordingly they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as a principle subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were by way of reprisals for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world." That this was not an exaggerated picture of the times we learn from an official charge of Archbishop Potter, A.D. 1738, which states:—"An open and professed disregard to religion is become through a variety of unhappy causes a distinguishing character of the present age. This evil is grown to a great height in the metropolis of the nation; is daily spread through every part of it; and bad in itself as this can be, must of necessity bring all others after it. Indeed it hath already brought in such dissoluteness and contempt of principle in the highest part of the world, and such profligate intemperance and fearlessness of committing crimes in the lower, as must, if this torrent of impiety stop not, become absolutely fatal. And God knows, far from stopping, it receives from the ill design of some persons and the inconsiderateness of others a continual increase. Christianity is now ridiculed and railed at with very little reserve, and the teachers of it without any at all." Many who wrote in favour of Christ's teaching adopted an apologetic tone, and even Bishop Butler is said to have expressed a conviction that the pillars of the Church were tottering. The following lines, adapted from a modern poet, fairly describe the situation:

"With the soft airs of summer there had come
 A torpor on her frame. A drowsy sloth
 Fettered her limbs like palsy, and her mien
 With all its loftiness, seem struck with eld.
 Even her voice was changed; a languid moan
 Taking the place of the clear silver key;
 And brain and sense grew faint; as if the light
 And very air were steeped in sluggishness."—(N. P. Willis)

Deistic and Trinitarian controversies raged all through the 18th century, not only in England but in France as well; where they resulted in the fearful reign of terror known in history as the *French Revolution* (A.D. 1789). A little before (1776) the faith of many intellectual people had been shaken by the publication of Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,' in which he accounted for the wonderful spread of Christianity in the primi-

tive ages on purely human grounds, without any recognition of Divine direction and support. Not long after (1790-4) the lower ranks of life were vitiated by the writings of *Tom Paine*; who had wandered over the world in search of a city to dwell in, and with difficulty escaped the guillotine at the hands of Robespierre. His books were full of rank blasphemy, and avowedly intended to cause discontent among the illiterate and poor. These pernicious writings drew forth valuable rejoinders from *Dr. Richard Watson*, bishop of Llandaff, which were written in plain and simple terms suited to the comprehension of unlearned folk; while for the better educated *Archdeacon Paley* wrote his famous 'Evidences of Christianity.' It will thus be seen that God never left Himself without witnesses, whether men would hear, or whether they would forbear. While on the subject of literature it must be stated that matters were not mended by the stage plays and works of fiction that

the Georgian era produced. If men like Samuel Richardson, the father of novelists, wrote 'namby-pamby' tales they were not improved upon by the coarseness of Fielding, Smollet, and Sterne; who cannot be excused from censure on the ground that they did but speak of things as they found them. If their books 'held the mirror up to nature' the social conditions of the time were not much to be proud of. Happily England was spared from the

destructive literature with which France was flooded at the same period by *François Marie Armet* (Voltaire) and *Jean Jacques Rousseau*, of whom Dr. Johnson once said, 'It is difficult to settle the proportion of iniquity between them.' In the midst of all this infidelity and immorality the simple faith of many Christian



OLNEY CHURCH, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE. people was preserved by scraps of sacred poetry, which appeared from time to time as lights in a dark place. We have not space to men-

tion more than one poet of the 18th century, whose name could not very well have been left out, viz. *William Cowper*; the friend of a very energetic and devoted parish priest. *John Newton*, who once had charge of the parish of Olney, in Buckinghamshire. It was at Mr. Newton's suggestion, and no doubt under the inspiration of his teaching, that Cowper wrote the Olney Hymns, many of which are incorporated in the hymnals of the present day, such as :—

‘O for a closer walk with God.’

‘There is a fountain filled with blood.’


‘Hark, my soul! it is the Lord.’

which show unmistakably that, even if the active and enterprising spirit of the Church lay dormant for a time, there was still real life in her. She was but slumbering after a wearying period of labour, sorrow, and strife. She would wake again to renewed energy

4. **The Wesleys.**—Among the best known of the country clergy, in the early part of the 18th century, was Samuel Wesley, rector of Epworth, in Lincolnshire; whose name, however, would scarcely have been handed down to posterity had not two of his children become famous. Both he and his wife Susanna were the offspring of puritan ministers, who had been ejected after the restoration, yet both discarded the principles of their parents and adopted those which were known as ‘High Church.’ Three of their sons, Samuel, John, and Charles, became clergymen, having been educated for that end in the University of Oxford. Samuel Wesley, junior, died in 1739, and did not make much of a mark in the world. *John Wesley*, was ordained deacon in 1725, and in the next year became fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. A careful study of Jeremy Taylor’s ‘Holy Living,’ and Law’s ‘Serious Call,’ impressed him with the necessity of leading a deeply religious life; and in 1728 he became curate to his father at Epworth. In the meantime the younger son, *Charles Wesley*, was graduating at the University. Their father had been a great defender of the devotional societies mentioned on page 197, and had established a flourishing one in his parish; so that the young Wesleys had been trained from infancy in a system of which they have been erroneously considered the originators. When John Wesley returned to Oxford to take up his position as a college tutor, he found that his brother Charles, then a student of Christchurch, had inaugurated such a society among a few undergraduates; who met every night for mutual improvement and devotion, and spent their spare time during the day in giving religious instruction in the charity schools, the jails, and workhouses; and generally, by their

¹ See the Churchman’s *Life of Wesley*, S.P.C.K., Home Library, 3s. 6l.; and Canon Overton’s *Evangelical Revival in the 18th Century*. Longmans, 2s. 6d.

life and conversation, endeavoured to influence for good the other students of the university, who had unhappily caught the materialistic spirit of that age. The leadership of the guild or, 'Holy Club' as it was contemptuously called, was naturally offered to John, who accepted it gladly. For their pains in trying to set a good example to those around them, they were subject to much ridicule by those who preferred profanity; and one of the nicknames by which the new society was known, the term 'Methodist,' stuck to the members all through life, until it became an honoured and well understood name, even among themselves. It seems strange now to read that their 'Method' consisted in a most strict observance of all that the Prayer-book demands from conscientious sons of the Church of



EPWORTH CHURCH, LINCOLNSHIRE.

England, but there can be no doubt of it. They fasted on all the appointed days, and communicated every Sunday or Holy Day. They also denied themselves of every luxury and amusement in order to save money for beneficent deeds. In 1735, soon after the death of their father, John and Charles accompanied General Oglethorpe and his party of Moravian emigrants to Georgia, Charles as the General's secretary, and John as a missionary under the direction of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. They did not have much success there, because they at once sought to impose Church discipline in all its fulness upon the Colony; instead of regarding their flock as

composed of persons whose training in the rudiments of Christianity had been utterly neglected, and who therefore needed to be nurtured gently with the milk of the Word.

The brothers Wesley returned in great disappointment after two years of fruitless labour, and joined the Moravian Society in Fetter Lane, London, which *Peter Bohler* had founded. From Bohler they learned the doctrine of 'conversion,' i.e., that each believer ought to be able to point to some definite time, place, and circumstance when, where, and by which the assurance of individual pardon and salvation came to his soul. John Wesley recorded with precision the circumstances of his own 'conversion,' as having taken place May 24, 1738, accompanied by feelings of ravishment, followed by an infinite calm. For a long time this ecstatic feeling was thought by the Wesleys to be a necessary condition and sign of individual acceptance with God; and is still so considered by certain Methodist societies, although the brothers soon found cause to renounce the idea. The Wesleys soon separated from the Moravians; and John began to be strongly impressed with the idea that he ought to go throughout the length and breadth of England, and reclaim the people from the spiritual apathy that was settling like a blight upon the nation. Up to 1739 the pulpits of the churches were freely open to him, but after that date the clergy developed a strong opposition to Methodism, owing to the remarkable powers of eloquence possessed by a young man to whom we must now refer.

5. George Whitefield.—Among the members of the Wesley Club at Oxford was a poor young man, son of a widow who kept an inn at Gloucester, George Whitefield by name; who was a servitor student at Pembroke College, Oxford. His genuine piety led the Bishop of Gloucester to ordain him before the canonical age; and when the Wesleys returned from Georgia he went thither to try his hand, but soon came back for money to carry on the mission. As Whitefield's preaching was known to be attended by very great excitement a prejudice arose against him, and he took to preaching in the open air with remarkable results. He began at Bristol, which at that time was a centre of vice in all its worst forms, and was the first to provide spiritual privileges for the colliers who lived like heathens near that city. Preaching in the open air was such an unheard of thing that 20,000 of these poor creatures crowded to hear him, and the white gutters caused by the tears which ran down their black cheeks shewed how visibly they were affected; strong men being moved to hysterical convulsions by his wondrous power. John Wesley joined him there, and was not a little perplexed at these 'bodily symptoms'; but at length he sought to encourage them as evident 'signs of grace,' notwithstanding that Whitefield considered them to be 'doubtful indications.' It is difficult to say wherein the effect of Whitefield's preaching lay; certainly not in his language or

logie, for his printed sermons and writings contain nothing remarkable; it must have been by earnestness and charm of voice, for presently he attracted to him the rich as well as the poor, and thus he was able to gain funds for his foreign expeditions. No less than seven times did he visit Georgia, no mean voyage in those days, and the traditions of every part of England bespeak his incessant labours as an itinerant preacher. It is said that he sometimes competed with the showmen at the fairs for the attention of the multitude, and that after one such occasion he received a thousand letters from different people in testimony of their 'conversion.' Of his power to move intellectual minds the great Benjamin Franklin gives independent testimony; having once heard Whitefield preach a Charity sermon. 'As he proceeded I began to soften, and concluded to give some copper; another stroke of his oratory made me ashamed of that, and determined me to give the silver; and he finished so admirably that I emptied my pocket wholly in the collector's dish, gold and all.' Whitefield had a commanding presence and fervid dramatic action; but he was only a preacher, and not always judicious. Also he soon diverged from Church doctrine and adopted the theories of the Calvinists, so that the Wesleys ceased to co-operate with him. Some of the revivalists who followed Whitefield eventually founded the community known as the 'Calvinistic Methodists,' but he always repudiated the idea of founding a sect. Although most fashionable people considered the emotionalism of the Methodists as a mark of vulgarity, there were others who thought differently; the most notable of these being *Selina, Countess of Huntingdon*, over whom Whitefield exercised great influence. She not only gathered round her men of rank and intelligence; but applied her own wealth, and funds that she raised, to train and support clergy who were to be considered as her chaplains. This coterie followed in the steps of Wesley and Whitefield by setting the parochial organization at naught, and there was much danger lest Church discipline and Church order might be placed at the mercy of a woman's arbitrary will. But a London clergyman obtained a legal decision against two of Lady Huntingdon's clergy, who preached in an unconsecrated building in his parish without authority, and then her ladyship had to 'register' her meeting houses as dissenting places of worship; her followers being known as *Lady Huntingdon's Connexion*. She established a training college for her ministers at Trevecca, in South Wales, which was afterwards removed to Cheshunt in Hertfordshire, and is now one of the richest of the Dissenting colleges. When the methods of her chaplains were proved to be an evasion of the law, many clergy walked no more with her; but the Calvinistic principles enunciated by Whitefield continued to spread among Churchmen, and their awakened zeal gave rise to what is known as the *Evangelical Party* within the Church. George Whitefield worked too hard to live long. He died in 1769, aged fifty-six.

6. **Methodism.**—Lives of John Wesley are so numerous and cheap that it is unnecessary to give a detailed description of his ministerial career in these pages, even were there room. He was undoubtedly great as a preacher, but it was in organization that he most excelled; and in this he has never been surpassed. His first deviation from the stereotyped customs of the Church was the appointment of *lay preachers*, whom he sent into every part of England and Wales to work in appointed 'circuits.' He did not wish their preaching to enter into competition with the ordinary Church services, but to supplement them. This began in 1741. Three years previously Wesley had opened preaching houses at Bristol and London, which we should now call 'Mission Halls'; and they were rapidly multiplied in all directions. There would have been nothing ecclesiastically unlawful in these measures had they received episcopal sanction; but Wesley was at all times impatient of direction, and could not see for many years, what others plainly perceived and pointed out to him, that they might at any time develop into a rival ministry and rival churches. By 1744 the Wesleyan plan was thoroughly organized into a system, and Charles Wesley hoped that it might receive official sanction as a powerful auxiliary of the Church. It ought to have been, and most certainly would be now; but this result was prevented by many errors of judgment on the part of John, and by the ambition of the lay preachers whom he had commissioned. The zeal of the latter made them welcome among the people, much to the chagrin of many careless and indifferent shepherds in neglected parts of the fold; but they soon began to consider appointment by Wesley as equal to ordination by a bishop. England was then reminded of the 'preaching friars' of mediæval times, and of the poor preachers of Wycliffe, who went about the country without license from the ordinary, and set the parochial system at defiance. A cry of 'Jesuits in disguise' arose against the new 'evangelists,' which greatly increased in 1745, owing to the political excitement of the Jacobite rebellion, with which it was said the 'Methodists' were in sympathy; and this not unfrequently resulted in stupid brute violence against the Wesleyan preachers. Although the bishops refused their sanction they did not hinder the cause, or inhibit the clergy who joined the Wesleys from preaching, as they had the power to do; but the movement was received with much hostility by many of the clergy whose parishes were invaded; some of whom unwisely refused to administer Holy Communion to the members of Wesleyan societies, when they came to church for that purpose in accordance with the rules of 'Methodism' which John and Charles Wesley had laid down. In such cases Wesley allowed the clergy who belonged to the societies to administer the Sacraments in the preaching houses, after which he allowed the lay-evangelists to use the Prayer-book. In 1749 Charles retired from the government of the societies, in which he had hitherto borne a

share, lest he should be held responsible for the schism that would inevitably follow if the lay-evangelists assumed priestly functions as they were inclined to do. Charles was the poet of the movement, and his hymns helped it on quite as much as the sermons and administration of his brother John had done. There is much power for good in sacred songs, and many of those written by Charles Wesley are sung by thousands who would not for a moment be classed with Methodists.

Jesu, lover of my soul !

Soldiers of Christ arise !

Lo ! he comes with clouds descending.

O ! for a heart to praise my God.

are some of those we owe to him, and many others have been altered and adapted, such as

Hark ! the herald angels sing.

Hail the day that sees him rise.

or Christmas and Easter. Charles Wesley died in 1788, and was buried in Marylebone Churchyard according to directions expressed by him just before his death, "I have lived and I die in the Communion of the Church of England, and I will be buried in the yard of my parish Church." John Wesley was of like mind, but after he lost his brother's co-operation he drifted nearer and nearer to the



THE REV. JOHN WESLEY.

rock of division. One of his numerous biographers tells us that "He lived and died a hearty but inconsistent churchman," which may be considered an epigram. Several times during his long life John Wesley had to combat the desire of his followers for independent existence, expressed by them in their annual conferences, but his vigorous administration staved off the evil day of schism. As John Wesley drew near his end it became necessary to incorporate the societies by deed in chancery, in order to provide for the government of the 'Connexion' after his death. This was done in 1784, and thenceforward the Methodist societies have been administered

by a corporation of 100 trustees, who form the 'Wesleyan Conference,' and meet annually. Methodism soon extended throughout what is now the United Kingdom, and made rapid strides in America. Its central home was at the City Road Chapel, London, E.C.; near which John Wesley lived, died and lies buried. In 1790, just before his death, he published these words, "I hold all the doctrines of the Church of England, I love her liturgy, and approve her plan of discipline, and only wish it could be carried out"; and to the last he deprecated any separation from the National Church. For a while after his death his wishes were respected, and so late as 1793 the 'Conference' declared, "We are determined in a body to remain in connexion with the Church of England"; and there has never been any formal or official declaration of schism; but the 'Conference' of 1795 practically separated Methodism from the Church of England, by claiming the power to confer priestly functions independently of the Catholic and Apostolic Episcopate. It resolved that in cases where the members of a society formally desired that the 'lay preacher' should administer sacraments it might be allowed. John Wesley is not free from the suspicion of having permitted this grave irregularity before his death. The 'lay preachers' were appointed by the Conference up to the year 1836; when the then president, ex-president, and secretary commenced the practice of *ordaining* to the ministry by 'laying on of hands,' although it is certain that the power of ordination had never been conferred on them. For this also they could claim the precedent created by John Wesley, who 'consecrated' Dr. Coke to be *Superintendent* of the Wesleyan Societies in America, from which anti-episcopal act the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States obtained their succession of 'bishops.' This explains the chief obstacle to unity between the various Methodist Societies and our Church. They seem to think it would be a reflection on the past and present status of their 'Ministry' if their preachers were to accept ordination at the hands of English bishops. We are not without hope that the schism may yet be healed. If the disposition for unity shall exist, the other obstacles will appear small, and readily to be moved away. The submission to the Anglican form of ordination will then, as a difficulty block the path no longer. When He, who needed no baptism from the hand of any man, desired to comply with an ancient rule, saying, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness," He spoke along the centuries to all who deem but lightly of forms and ceremonies, and to all who are ruled by that feeling which by some is called pride, and by others self-respect' (See *Urlin's Life of Wesley*, S.P.C.K., 4/-).

7. The 'Evangelical Revival.'—George III. prided himself on being an Englishman born and bred, and as he resolved to avoid the immorality and scepticism that disgraced his predecessors there was

some hope for religion under his rule ; although it was long before the tide of infidelity was arrested. The rough awakening from lethargy that Methodism had brought to the Church of England was not without its good results, notwithstanding that for a long time her clergy seemed undecided as to the best course to adopt. The firm administration of the diocese of London by Bishop Porteus dissuaded many from the disregard of episcopal authority which was the bane of Methodism ; but the Wesleyan idea of 'Conversion,' and the Huntingdonian system which denied man's free-will, had taken a great hold upon many earnest minds within the Church. The more direct result to the Church of the 'Methodist revival' was the undue exaltation of preaching. The clergy seem to have endeavoured to evangelise the land afresh ; for they addressed professing Christians after the style in which St. Paul might have addressed the Athenians who had never heard of the atonement. In spite of its incongruity this practice had a wondrous effect upon the fashionable world ; in which most men and women had so entirely neglected attention to spiritual concerns that they seemed to be quite unconscious of their need of a Saviour. To bring home to such people a strong conviction of their exceeding sinfulness, and a sense of God's amazing love to man in sacrificing His own dear Son, was indeed a great and glorious work.—And this was done with such success that before the close of the 18th century a whole army of sincere and earnest men and women were devoting themselves to the task of reclaiming all ranks of life from the depths of iniquity into which they had sunk. In the numerous biographies and memoirs of that age

"We read of faith and purest charity

In statesman, priest, and humble citizen."

Henry Venn the elder, James Hervey, William Romaine, Hannah More, Charles Simeon, John Thornton the banker, Richard Cecil, and *William Wilberforce* are names still freshly remembered as having been in the van of the revival ; and of these the last mentioned occupies the foremost place, not only by reason of his eminence as a politician and philanthropist, but also on account of his earnest and genuine piety. When a young man he was brought under Whitefield's influence, to the dismay of his grandfather, who angrily said, 'If Billy turns Methodist, he shall not have sixpence of mine.' His mother, too, feared that his religious scruples might make him censorious. Neither suspicion was realised, for, after consultation with the same Mr. Newton who suggested the *Olney Hymns* to Cowper, he became the model of a Christian statesman. His memory is universally beloved for his efforts in suppressing the traffic in human flesh which disgraced the world ; for it was mainly through his influence that Parliament passed the Acts of 1787 and 1807, the one to mitigate the sufferings of slaves on board ship, the other to abolish the iniquitous traffic altogether. It was not until the close of his long life (1833), after he had retired from active politics, that

his complete idea of the emancipation of slaves was accomplished by the Parliamentary grant of £20,000,000 in compensation to the colonial slave owners. But Wilberforce was equally intent upon uprooting the national sins of sabbath breaking, duelling, pugilism, profanity, intemperance, and other social evils. His *Practical view of Christianity*, published at the close of the 18th century, was intended to promote consistency of character among Christians ; and



it was through him that Henry Martyn became the pioneer missionary of the East India Company's trading stations, and that a bishop and three archdeacons were sent to Calcutta in 1814. His advice was sought by men of all parties whenever any idea was afloat for the general welfare, and when he died the whole country mourned the loss of his boundless sympathy and genial face. Our illustration is a photographure of his monument in Westminster Abbey.

There was one great fault in the 'Evangelical Revival':—it undervalued the ecclesiastical system of Creeds, Sacraments, Public Worship, and the yearly round of fasts and festivals. The prominence given by it to the great doctrine of the Atonement

to the exclusion, or nearly so, of other essential parts of the Christian scheme ; and the excessive merit applied to preaching, because of its immediate effect in the hands of worthy men at the time of religious lethargy ; are now generally acknowledged to be defects which prevented it from permanently influencing the Church, or building up Christians after they had been 'converted.' At any rate, however the fact may be accounted for, a fact it is that the intense vigour and earnestness which marked the prime movers in the revival did not descend to their successors in either ministry or congregations, and the wretched dilapidations of the churches in the second quarter of the 19th century shewed plainly that something was wanting.

8. 'Evangelical' Societies : The C.M.S.—But the missionary spirit which moved the founders of the Evangelical movement to stir up their brethren at home, impelled them also to think of the spiritual condition of the heathen lands from which the slaves had been chiefly drawn. The friendship with Dissenters, that was courted by the more decidedly Calvinistic members of the revival, resulted in the formation of 'unsectarian' societies, in which nonconformists and 'evangelical' Churchfolk co-operated, although the latter were the largest subscribers. Among them may be mentioned the *London Missionary Society*, founded in 1795 by 'all denominations,' which in time became exclusively a Dissenting corporation; the *Religious Tract Society*, founded in 1799, the committee of which has always been composed of an equal number of Nonconformists and Churchmen; and the *British and Foreign Bible Society*, founded in 1804, which has been instrumental in translating and circulating the Scriptures, complete and in portions, in a very great number of foreign languages; besides cheap copies in our own tongue. The total issues of the British and Foreign Bible Society since its formation up to 1889 "were 120,136,781 copies of Holy Scripture, in whole or in part;" and Churchmen are represented on its committee in the proportion of 15 to 36. These societies may yet be powerful aids to the re-union of Christendom. But the greatest outcome of the Evangelical revival was the *Church Missionary Society*; the continued and increasing popularity of which demonstrates the noblest principle of that movement. It was set on foot April 12, 1799, for the purpose of sending missionaries amongst the heathen; because 'as it appeared from the printed reports of the S.P.G. and S.P.C.K. that those societies confined their labours to the British Plantations in America and to the West Indies, there seemed to be still wanting in the Established Church a Society for sending missions to the continent of Africa or the other parts of the heathen world.' The C.M.S. was at first called 'The Missionary Society for Africa and the East,' from a desire to avoid friction, even in name, with the missionary work of the older societies which were working elsewhere. Its operations are not now restricted to any special portion of the globe. Its first president was the Rev. John Venn. The word 'Church' was added to its name in 1812, probably to distinguish it from the other 'Evangelical' societies just mentioned. Since that time its work has gone on steadily increasing. It would be impossible to express here a tithe of the work undertaken by it; but some idea may be gathered from the following figures.¹ Its income for the year 1890-91 was £247,737. It has 327 missionary stations; in Africa, Asia, India, Ceylon, the Mauritius, China, Japan, New Zealand, North-west Territories and the Pacific. It supports 303 European ordained Missionaries; 278 Native; 57 European lay

¹ Taken from *Official Year Book of the Church of England* for 1892.

Missionaries ; 76 Lady Missionaries, exclusive of missionaries' wives ; 3,791 Native Christian Lay Teachers ; 154,673 Native Christian Adherents ; 50,005 Native Communicants ; 1,718 Schools ; and 70,311 Scholars. In connection with the Church Missionary Society there is also a Zenana Mission, whereby Eastern women are reached.

9. Parliamentary Grants.¹—It is sometimes objected against the Church of England that during the Georgian Era she received large sums of money from Parliament towards the building and endowing of churches ; and from this it is argued that Parliament has the right to take away the monies by which the Church is now supported. Oddly enough this argument comes chiefly from the Dissenters, who have themselves received a larger sum of money from Parliament than the Church has done—*e.g.*, the Presbyterians and Dissenters of Ireland received £1,903,854 ; while the Presbyterians and Dissenters of England and Wales obtained about £216,660. Add £768,929 received by the Irish Nonconformists in commutation of their grants in 1870, and a total of £2,889,383 is arrived at. The grants to English Dissenters came about in this way—In A.D. 1722, Sir Robert Walpole, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, recommended George I. to pay out of the Royal Treasury an allowance to certain distressed Dissenting ministers as a charitable grant from the king's personal bounty ; hence it was known as the *Regium Donum*. The recipients were Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists in equal proportions. On the other hand the Church of England has received as follows : From A.D. 1809 to A.D. 1820 annual grants of £100,000 for the augmentation of poor livings, which was distributed through Queen Anne's Bounty Board. In A.D. 1818, £1,000,000 was granted in aid of church building, and this was supplemented by £500,000 more in A.D. 1824. Thus the total sum received by the National Church is £289,283 less than that bestowed upon Nonconformists. It has been stated that the two large grants for church building did not come out of the taxes, but was the surplus of a war indemnity paid to this country by Austria after the battle of Waterloo, and that it was ungrudgingly given as a thankoffering.

“ For liberty, and triumphs on the main,
And laurelled armies—not to be withstood,
What serve they ? if, on transitory good
Intent, and sedulous of abject gain
The State (ah, surely not preserved in vain !)
Forbear to shape due channels which the flood
Of sacred truth may enter—till it brood
O'er the wide realm.”

Great Britain had lately enjoyed a large measure of prosperity, and everyone felt liberally minded ; the only sad reflection being

¹ See Lord Selborne's *Defence of the Church* (Macmillan 2/6 pp. 211—218.

that vice and infidelity had far too long disgraced our nation. The 'Evangelical Revival' had proved that religion could stem the torrent of iniquity; and it was a wise policy for the advisers of George III. to encourage the local endeavours of Churchmen to build new churches in poor and populous parishes. The sums received for the repairing and building of churches were expended by a Church Building Commission, and from its report in 1831 we find that some of the money went in loans, and some was spent in Scotland, but that most was given in small grants to meet private benefactions contributed by the localities for which the new churches were provided.

The high favour with which the government then regarded the Church is mainly due to the remarkable influence of *Joshua Watson* who was the leader in all Church enterprises during the first quarter of this century. He extended the influence of the S.P.C.K. by organising depositories all over England; and was the prime mover in the formation and early work of the *National Society* in 1811, of which we shall speak more fully in chapter XXIX. As treasurer of the S.P.C.K. he was instrumental in handing over to the S.P.G. the missionary trusts of S.P.C.K., so that each society might pursue a single object with undivided energy. The Indian Episcopate was the immediate outcome of this simplification. He also promoted the *Incorporated Church Building Society*, A.D. 1818, which has been instrumental in stimulating marvellous liberality among Church people to provide free and unappropriated seats for the poor in the large majority of our churches. During the first twenty years of the 19th century, the average number of churches built yearly all over England was less than five, but in the next ten years over 300 were built. It was through Mr. Watson's indefatigable zeal that the grants for church-building were voted by Parliament. He was one of the commissioners appointed to distribute those grants; and it was through him that State aid was provided to create the West Indian Episcopate, in order to cement that colony to the mother country, lest it might secede as America had done.



CHAPTER XXVIII.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

"A State whose generous will through earth is dealt ;
 A State—which, balancing herself between
 License and slavish order, dares be free."—Wordsworth.

1. Removal of Nonconformist Disabilities.—It was our duty to state the means by which certain repressive laws against different bodies of religionists came upon the statute book. It is now a more pleasing task to show the various steps by which they were removed. The principle of toleration was laid down in the reign of William III. (page 196), for, by the Toleration Act, as Judge Mansfield pointed out, 'the Dissenter's way of worship is permitted and allowed ; it is not only exempted from punishment, but rendered innocent and lawful ; it is established ; it is put under the protection, and is not merely under the connivance of the law.' At the same time it was felt by each succeeding government that civil offices ought not to be placed in the charge of anyone who was not a Churchman, and therefore Nonconformists were disabled from taking any official share in the affairs of state. In process of time, when the fear of recurrence to the excesses of the Commonwealth had subsided, these disabilities were found to press hardly on many conscientious persons, and also to deprive the realm of the advice and co-operation of many worthy citizens. During the reign of Queen Anne, as we saw, 'occasional conformity' was declared illegal ; although the Act which made it so was soon repealed. But the 'Test' and 'Corporation' Acts remained in force. In 1728 an annual Act of Indemnity came into existence, renewed from year to year, which relieved certain office holders from the penalties imposed by those Acts for non-reception of Holy Communion ; though the Acts themselves remained in force. The Toleration Act of 1689 had exempted all Nonconformists, except Romanists and Socinians, from subscription to the disciplinary portions of the 39 Articles, though they were obliged to sign the doctrinal parts ; but after 1779, subscription to the Articles was no longer required from 'Protestant Nonconformists' who declared their belief in the Old and New Testaments. After this the Test and Corporation Acts did not press hardly on Dissenters ; yet their retention on the statute book was a serious reflection upon the social status of those who did not wish to attend Church services. In 1787 an attempt was made to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts altogether ; but the House of Commons decided, by a large majority, to retain what were then considered national safeguards. Two years later a second attempt was made and failed, though only by twenty votes, and for many years no further action was taken to repeal them *en bloc*. Efforts were made

however, to repeal them piecemeal, by obtaining exemption from certain exceptional clauses. In 1812 Dissenting ministers were relieved from certain penalties of the 'Conventicle Act' which the Toleration Act of 1689 had not repealed; and in 1813 the Socinian assemblies which had hitherto suffered the greatest repression, were allowed free expression of their peculiar interpretations. After this the Test and Corporation Acts were a nullity, and in 1828 they ceased to form part of the law of the land. Thus the last obstacle to civil and religious liberty, so far as the public profession of Christianity was concerned, was removed." But there were still some matters in which Nonconformist ministers were at a disadvantage as compared with the Church clergy, *e.g.*, until 1836 no marriage was valid unless solemnised by a Clergyman of the Church of England; but in that year the legislature accepted the principle that had been in vogue during the Commonwealth by regarding marriage as a civil contract merely. From that time, by having the civil registrar in attendance, Nonconformists might be married in any Dissenting place of worship. By the Act 3 and 4 William IV., c. 30, chapels were put upon equal terms with the ancient churches by being exempted from taxation, so long as they are exclusively appropriated to public religious worship; and thus, by many successive stages, Protestant Nonconformists obtained for their communities the fullest recognition and protection by the State.

2. Encroachments upon Church Privileges.—If we were to imagine that Dissenters would be satisfied with such results we should be mistaken; for perfect religious liberty was by no means enough for many of them. Perfect equality of possessions and privileges was and is their further aim. Under the title of the 'Anti-State Church Society,' founded in 1844, many opponents of the Church of England have agitated to despoil her of her rightful inheritance; and when it was found that the name of their association was too repellent they changed it to "The Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control," now better known by the abbreviated name of the *Liberation Society*. The principles of its members seem to be akin to the extremest communistic ideas; for their chief motive is the seizure and distribution of the Church's material possessions, so that she may be prevented from maintaining her ancient and inherited position as the chief religious teacher of the land. With this Society none of the cherished heritages of Churchmen are sacred, and many of them have already been forfeited to its determined agitations. *e.g.*—In days when Nonconformity was unknown each parish provided for the repair of its Church and churchyard by a special rate, which was levied like any other local tax. An attempt was made by Parliament in 1833 to abolish Church Rates, although their payment dated from the most ancient times. That attempt failed; but the Liberation Society

agitated, and from time to time caused resolutions against them to be moved in the House of Commons. In 1851 a 'Church Rate Abolition Bill' obtained an equal number of votes for and against it in the House of Commons, and therefore, as is customary, the Speaker gave his casting vote against it. Eventually (1868) the compulsory payment of Church Rates was abolished, though in certain places they are paid voluntarily. Again, it is well-known that the colleges of our Universities were founded by Churchmen for higher education in the principles of the Church of England. Accordingly, all persons who wished to avail themselves of educational facilities therein were expected to attend Church services regularly, and subscribe Church formularies before they could obtain degrees or fellowships. In 1871, these University Tests were abolished. Further, Nonconformists had all along been as free to acquire sites for burying grounds as they were to possess buildings for religious worship. But they soon desired to share with Churchmen the old churchyards, which had been acquired and consecrated for the interment of those whose profession of Christianity had been sealed by the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, and which were as much the exclusive property of the Church of England as any of her fabrics are. The exclusive right and privilege of the Church of England clergy to perform religious services in those churchyards was the envy of Liberationists; and they rested not until they succeeded in passing an Act (1880) by which Nonconformist ministers might perform funeral services in land so consecrated; although their communities had for a long time ceased to take any part in contributing to the repair of churchyards. We know that even this is insufficient to satisfy them, but we must earnestly endeavour to prevent the fulfilment of their ultimate desire to use our churches for Nonconformist public worship. They have every liberty to worship God as they please; they have fabrics and possessions in and by which they may do so; we have no desire to interfere with them in the exercise of such liberties or the enjoyment of such possessions; but Churchmen must be thoroughly determined to withstand their efforts to encroach further upon the privileges and rights of the National Church.

3. Removal of Romanist Disabilities.—We have seen that no relief was allowed to the Romanists by the Toleration Act of 1689; and the chief reason why the Test and Corporation Acts were not repealed sooner was that many Nonconformists, who have ever been extremely bitter against the Church of Rome, were anxious to exclude Romanists from participating in the benefits of such repeal. In 1778, a measure of relief was accorded to the Romanists, at the instance of Sir George Saville, who obtained the repeal of an Act of 1698 which had allowed the 'Protestant' children of Romanists to exclude their parents from inheriting property, and younger children who were Protestant to supplant their elder brethren who might be

Romanists. About the same time *Chief Justice Mansfield* put a liberal construction on other penal laws against Romanists, when they were brought before him in the Law Courts. It may be taken as an illustration of the deep seated horror of papalism in the nation that these humane measures were considered by many as dangerous to the country. An ultra-Protestant named *Lord George Gordon* drew up a petition to Parliament against any concessions to those whom he called 'the followers of Antichrist,' which was very extensively signed. Lord Gordon proceeded with it to the House of Lords at the head of a howling mob of enthusiasts, who shamefully illtreated the aged Judge Mansfield and some of the bishops. They afterwards burned the Romanist chapels, and the private houses of known adherents of that religion, together with the mansion of Lord Mansfield. They then destroyed the prisons, and attempted to attack the Bank of England, where however they were resisted by a strong body of soldiers (A.D. 1780). Here we may remind the reader of the two chief reasons for the perpetually recurring outbreaks of popular fury against Romanism, whereby full liberty and license were accorded to every petty non-papal conventicle before a Romanist Relief Bill could become law. There was first the innate dread of any recurrence to the foreign despotism, which had wrought such evil to the realm in mediæval times, and such persecution of Christians at the time of the Reformation; but there was a very natural fear besides that toleration of Romanists would result in the spread of the erroneous doctrines and practices which the Council of Trent had declared absolute. At the same time it was not possible for religious liberty to make progress in the country unless the Romanists were permitted to share therein. The annual Act of Indemnity for Dissenters contrasted so strangely with the continued exclusion of Romanists from official positions in the State that, in 1817 it was found impossible any longer to exclude Romanists from the Army or Navy. In 1825, a bill was read a third time in the House of Commons which would have repealed all the penal statutes against members of the Church of Rome. This failed to pass the House of Lords, and was dropped for a season. After the Test and Corporation Acts had been repealed, the arguments against the retention of Romanist disabilities would not hold water; and Mr. Peel re-introduced the bill for the emancipation of Romanists from the oppressive laws against them. It passed both houses by large majorities, and became law in April, 1829. Thus all Christians of every sort and kind were set free from every vestige of oppression.

4. **The New Papal Hierarchy.**—It will now be seen that Romanists made full use of their freedom. The arguments for their emancipation had gained a host of friends for them, and they proceeded to erect churches with vigour. We shall see in the next chapter that they waited on the outskirts of an ecclesiastical revival

within the Church of England, ready to entice by fair promises of rewards and dignities, such as should find themselves too much restrained by her formularies. Having in this way won over to themselves several famous and many rich members of the National Church they floated their deeply planned but long delayed scheme of a *rival Episcopate*. On September 30th, 1850, a papal bull was published in England which divided our country into certain ecclesiastical divisions or dioceses, each of which was to be governed for the pope by a bishop, under a so called 'Archbishop of Westminster.' There had not previously been any Roman bishops in England, save the bishops *in partibus* and vicars apostolic, who had not ventured to assume territorial titles; and this aggression of the pope, by which a number of prelates responsible to none but himself were imposed upon our nation, was a distinct intrenchment upon the prerogatives of the



THE CITY OF ROME.

English Crown. A storm of indignation rose against the bull. "Is it here," said *The Times*, "in Westminster, among ourselves, and by the English throne, that an Italian priest is to parcel out the spiritual dominion of this country, to employ the renegades of our national Church to restore foreign usurpation over the consciences of men, and to sow division in our political society by an undisguised and systematic hostility to the institutions most nearly identified with our national freedom and our national faith." So unparalleled and furious was the opposition from the public and the press that an 'Ecclesiastical Titles Act' was passed as a protest, which declared the bull null and void, and imposed a fine of £100 on all who should try to carry it into effect. The nation was somewhat quieted by this measure,

but the Romanists were sufficiently numerous and influential to render the Act a dead letter. It was repealed in 1871.

That there is very little hope of the Church of Rome forsaking its errors on matters of faith may be judged from the fact that in December, 1869 a great Council was held at the *Vatican*, where the pope holds his court; which not only reaffirmed all the erroneous tenets of the Council of Trent, but formulated also other and more pernicious dogmas as matters of essential belief: notably, that it is impossible for the bishop of Rome to do wrong when acting officially, generally called the doctrine of *Papal Infallibility*; and that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived by her mother without human sin, which is known as the doctrine of the *Immaculate Conception*. Neither of these novel dogmas have the slightest warrant in Scripture, nor can they be proved by the practice of the primitive Church or the writings of the Early Christian Fathers; and the attempt to formulate them now as doctrines of the Holy Catholic Church because, forsooth, the prelates of the new papal hierarchy in England, and the bishops *in partibus* who upheld papal pretensions in other parts of the world, gave an appearance of 'universality' to that Vatican Council by their presence, is a daring violation of history and reason such as cannot be paralleled outside the Roman obedience. The most recent phases of Rome's modern aggression have been the reception of a papal *nuncio* in Ireland, with a consequent interference by the bishop of Rome in Irish politics; and the unblushing abuse of the pulpit on the part of Romish bishops in England to promote a revival of temporal power for the Papacy, in Italy to begin with.

5. Removal of Jewish Disabilities.—In the year 1290 Edward I. expelled the Jews from England. Public opinion at that time was greatly stirred against them because of their usury, and because of a curious antipathy to them as a religious community owing to their ancestors' crime on Calvary. From that time, and until the days of Oliver Cromwell, the Jews were only admitted into England upon sufferance; certainly they were not allowed the public exercise of their belief. During and since the Commonwealth they were included in the same category as Nonconformist sects, but were precluded from all public offices because of their inability to take any kind of Christian oath. In the struggle for religious liberty not only did no one care for them, but by common consent their cause was studiously omitted from every statute introduced to Parliament for the relief of Nonconformists. In the first Parliament that met after the great Reform Bill, a Jewish Relief Bill was introduced to the Commons and read three times, but on being sent to the House of Lords it was thrown out. That same year (1833) an Act was passed by which Quakers and others were allowed to substitute an affirmation 'on the true faith of a Christian' for the Oath of Allegiance; but very few were prepared to admit Jews into the legislature of a

Christian land. In November, 1847, *Baron Rothschild* was elected by the City of London, where his high character, beneficence, and honourable dealing had won for him much fame. The majority of the members of the House of Commons were willing that he should sit among them and re-introduced the Jewish Relief Bill, but the House of Lords again rejected it by 163 votes to 128. Nothing daunted, Baron Rothschild went again to his constituents and was re-elected; though of course he could not sit under the existing law. At the general election of 1852, he was returned for the third time; and once more a Relief Bill passed the Commons, but failed to find a favourable majority in the House of Lords. The Bishops were naturally against it. Indeed, it is hardly possible to conceive how they could be otherwise, for they were representatives of an estate of the realm whose object, from time immemorial, had been to uphold the Christian character of our nation and its laws. In April, 1857, there was another general election; and as soon as the excitement and extra Parliamentary business that followed the *Indian Mutiny* had subsided, the Jewish Relief Bill was once more brought before Parliament. It empowered either House to modify its oath in the case of Jews by special resolution. This time the House of Lords accepted the measure by 143 votes to 97. Public offices were thus opened to all persons who believe in a Supreme Being. It was at this time that the Government of India was transferred from the East India Company to the English Crown.

6. The Irish Church.—On page 178 we briefly reviewed the progress of events connected with the Anglican Church in Ireland up to the reign of James II. As briefly we must glance at its subsequent history. After the victories of William III. over the forces which sought to restore James II. Romanists were forbidden to sit in the Irish Parliament; and many repressive laws were passed against them during the reigns of William III. and Queen Anne. In 1704 the Test Act was extended to Ireland, and in 1713 the Schism Act (see page 209) was put in force there. William III. had restored the Anglican clergy to the Irish benefices, whence they had been excluded by the Romanists under *Tyrconnel's* rule; but the mischief of this was that the English government made use of the clergy, or at any rate of the bishops, in Ireland to anglicize that country and repress all native interests. In 1719 the English Parliament undertook to legislate for Ireland; and when it was found that the Romanist electorate predominated, the 'Irishry' were not allowed to vote. Clergy were permitted to hold any number of benefices in plurality, owing to the loss of glebe land through the political disturbances. The churches fell into decay and the parsonages went to ruin. It was hardly likely that the natives would care much to belong to a Church which they identified with repressive legislation. In 1779 Dissenters were admitted to civil offices in Ireland, but there

was no relief for Romanists. In 1782 a long agitation resulted in the sister isle regaining its Parliamentary independence, although it was still subject to the English Crown. The following year bills for the relief of Romanists were passed in the Irish Parliament, and the franchise was restored to them. But soon after an association of malcontents, called the *United Irishmen*, entered into treasonable correspondence with France; and stirred up rebellion against the English rule (1794). It was then that the ultra Protestants in

Ireland formed themselves into *Orange Lodges* as a counter movement to that of the *United Irishmen*. The rebellion broke out in 1798, and was not suppressed without much cruelty; the result being that Ireland and Ireland's Church were united to England and England's Church by the 'Act of Union' in 1800. In 1831 Parliament voted £30,000 towards elementary education in Ireland; but owing to the religious rivalry and bitterness this money was wisely restricted to 'undenominational schools.' The opposition to the Anglican Church in Ireland now became very great. The tithes were unpaid, and the clergy were starving; and



CHOIR OF ARMAGH CATHEDRAL

therefore many people welcomed the 'Irish Church Temporalities Act' of 1833, by which ten of the ancient bishoprics were suppressed and £1,000,000 voted to the clergy towards compensation for their arrears of tithe. There used to be four Irish archbishops and twenty-seven bishops; now there are only two archbishops, *Armagh* and *Dublin*, and eleven bishops. The sees were not altogether suppressed, but united with others; and most of the present Irish bishops bear the title of two or three ancient

bishoprics in their official names. Soon after this a formidable agitation was directed against the Church in Ireland, and in 1856 an Act was introduced to the House of Commons to disestablish it. The bill was rejected by 163 to 93. The agitation was continued with vigour and was made a party political question in 1868 by Mr. Gladstone, then prime minister; who in March, 1869, brought in a new bill to disestablish and disendow the Church in Ireland as a government measure; in spite of the fact that its maintenance had been guaranteed by the Act of Union, and that its title to property was more ancient than any other species of property in Ireland. We need not stay to explain the steps by which this measure passed through its various phases; it is sufficient to say that it became law, and that its provisions came into force on and after January 1, 1871. The surplus funds of the Irish Church, after the vested interests of incumbents were provided for, have since been applied to the support of hospitals and lunatic asylums, the commutation of grants to Irish Nonconformists (page 229), the permanent endowment of a Roman Catholic college at Maynooth which had been receiving an annual Government grant since 1845, and other charitable objects needing funds from time to time. Liberationists are anxious to make the disestablishment of the Irish Church a precedent for similar measures respecting the English Church; notwithstanding that the circumstances of the two Churches are vastly different. The present agitation for the disunion of England and Ireland is closely connected with the disunion of the Churches, and provides an obvious warning to the English people that they should avoid all temptations to meddle with the status and possessions of our own National Church.

7. Removal of Atheist Disabilities.—As one by one the various religious bodies, Dissenters, Romanists, and Jews, were admitted to privileges from which the misdeeds of their ancestors had deprived them, but which their own tried loyalty proved them to be not unworthy of, the Church of England submitted with good grace; though she had felt it to be her bounden duty to resist and warn until there was sufficient assurance that her own rights and the honour of the realm would be preserved. Of the Nonconformists it could be shown that they were professing Christians after all; and of the Jews there could be no doubt that they were fervent and traditional worshippers of Jehovah, though they declined to recognise the Messiahship of Jesus. The religious character of the nation need not be endangered by their admission to the fullest civil privileges or the widest religious liberty; though the rights of the National Church might be encroached upon. It was otherwise when avowed atheists and deniers of God's existence sought to tread in their steps. It was indeed well known that some of those who outwardly conformed to the conditions of membership in the House of Commons were unbelievers at heart, but still it was something that Parliament

should possess "the form of godliness." But in 1880 Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, an avowed atheist, was elected to the House of Commons and a new set of disabilities had to be removed. To his credit we must record that he preferred not to sail in under false colours; and to the credit of Parliament we must remember that it at first refused to allow him to take his seat. Having been declared disqualified for membership the seat for which he was returned was declared vacant; but his constituents returned him again and again. In 1882, Mr. Bradlaugh unwisely took the law into his own hands by going through the farce of administering the Oath of Allegiance to himself although he had previously declared the words 'So help me, God,' to be meaningless to him. An oath is a religious act by which God is called to witness for the confirmation of some matter of doubt. It is an appeal of two parties to Almighty God by which He is called to witness the act about to be performed. Not only cannot a professed Atheist, therefore, take an oath, which is an appeal to a Being in whose existence and attributes he does not believe; but to administer it to him is an insult and mockery to Him who is invoked by the oath, and to whom it is an appeal. The House of Commons voted Mr. Bradlaugh's expulsion from the precincts of the house, but subsequently allowed him the run of the private rooms and access to the legislative chamber below the bar. He was precluded from voting under heavy penalties, yet he had obtained a vantage ground from which he could influence the members, and create a reversion of feeling among them in his favour. Ultimately (1885) a short act was passed by which, instead of the customary parliamentary oath, a member could qualify for his seat by making the following affirmation:

"I A. B. do solemnly, sincerely, and truly declare and affirm." and then proceed with the words of the oath prescribed by law, omitting any words of imprecation or calling to witness' (Clause 2 of the Affirmation Act, 1885).

Under the powers of this act Mr. Bradlaugh was enabled to take his seat; and afterwards showed himself very anxious to get rid of oaths of every kind. In 1888 he introduced a Bill to the House of Commons to abolish oaths in parliament, courts of law, and all other places 'for all purposes where an oath has hitherto been required by law, and to substitute a solemn affirmation, whenever any person should object to be sworn on the ground that he has no religious belief, or that the taking of an oath is contrary to his religious belief.' After the addition of an amendment which provided for the validity of oaths when taken, and their continuance wherever they would be conscientiously binding, this act was read a third time in the House of Commons, Aug. 9, 1888, by 147 votes to 60. It passed the House of Lords a few months later, so that nothing now remains upon our Statute book in any way disabling persons from enjoying the fullest license to do as they please in matters that affect their

religious or non-religious opinions. Let us hope, however, that this last concession to atheists and nonjurors will not increase the number of those who desire to destroy religion altogether.

8. The Ecclesiastical Commission.—As the various religious bodies obtained more and more liberty, they proceeded to use it in attacking the Church of England. They claimed that the recognition and protection of themselves by the State made the Church no longer co-extensive in theory with the whole nation, and clamoured to be exempt from contributing to its support. In other words, every increase of privileges for Nonconformists was held to imply a corresponding decrease of privileges in the National Church. They sought to benefit themselves at her expense. Yet although the functions of Convocation were suspended, so that the Church could not offer any united and formal protest against such insidious attacks, there has still been a strong sense of justice pervading the majority of our civil legislators; through which her external foundations have been preserved thus far. Parliament has never yet legislated upon spiritual questions without reference to the clergy, and the measures which have encroached upon the temporalities of the Church in any way, have not seriously affected her position. At the time of the Great Reform Bill agitation the wildest statements were circulated as to the fabulous wealth of the Church, and in 1831 a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into Ecclesiastical revenues. Churchmen were needlessly frightened at the prospect in view, for although the Commissioners proposed drastic changes in their several reports as to the redistribution of clerical incomes, nothing but advantage has resulted to the Church from their labours. There was no desire on the part of Sir Robert Peel's Government to alienate Church property, either in England or Ireland, from strictly ecclesiastical purposes; but it was clear that the anomalies in the then existing distribution of ecclesiastical revenues needed readjustment. In days when the proportion of bishops to clergy and people was much greater than in modern times, the relative incomes were not seriously unequal; but while the dissolution of monasteries had permanently impoverished the parish clergy, of whom many more were absolutely necessary, the retention of capitular estates by the cathedral bodies through all changes made the revenues of dignitaries seem excessively disproportionate to those of many parochial incumbents. In 1836 the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were incorporated as a permanent body to deal with these capitular estates, and after setting aside sufficient for the payment of specified incomes to the bishops and cathedral staff, and providing suitable residences for them, to apply the residue to the augmentation of poor livings, and the endowment of new ones in populous places. Still more salutary was the recommendation of the Commissioners that no benefice was thereafter to be held *in commendam*. The chief sources of ecclesiastical revenues were the

tithes of the produce of land. From the earliest times they had been paid in kind, and many tithe barns are still standing which were erected for storing the produce. This had given rise to many harassing disputes between tithe owners and tithe payers; and to set such disputes at rest an act was passed in 1836 (6 & 7 Wm. IV., c. 71) by which tithes in kind were commuted into a *tithe rent-charge* payable in money on the first of January and the first of July in each year. The amount of the rent-charge in any year was to be fixed according to the average price of corn during the seven previous years. This measure was made chiefly in the interests of the tithe payers, and it is estimated that the Church lost a considerable portion of its revenues



THE HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT.

by the change; but this loss has been more than compensated by the comparative cessation of disputes. Unfortunately they have lately been revived by Liberationist agitators, and in several parts of the country organised opposition has been started against paying tithes in any form. It is to be hoped that the innate sense of justice that pre-eminently distinguishes Englishmen will resent the new phase of communism that lies at the root of this hostile movement.

9. Disestablishment.—The first serious attack upon the time-honoured connection between the Church and Realm of England occurred at the time of the Reform Bill. The bishops had exercised their legislative functions by voting according to their consciences

against the bill, and the exasperated promoters of it menaced them with popular opprobrium for so doing, and charged them to 'set their houses in order.' There was no mistaking the significance of this outcry. 'The bishops were threatened to be driven from their stations because they did not vote for ministers; because for once they had thus voted upon the greatest question agitated since the Revolution.' (Speech of Bishop Philpotts.) In 1834 Lord Ripon actually introduced a bill to suspend the legislative and judicial functions of the Lords Spiritual; but this unjust attack upon the rights of the foremost estate of the realm was rejected by 125 votes to 28. In 1851 'a judiciously manipulated religious census' gave an apparent though grossly inaccurate numerical superiority over Churchmen by the aggregate combination of all Nonconformists. The Liberation Society then redoubled its attacks upon the National Church. Its methods were peculiar. The most outrageous misconceptions of the Church's history and position were unblushingly reiterated and published broadcast; and every little imperfection in her administration, or in the character of her clergy, was magnified to enormous dimensions. It was needful that something should be done to counteract their misrepresentations. Accordingly, in 1860 a new organisation, known as the *Church Defence Institution*, was formed 'to combine, as far as possible, Churchmen of every shade of political and religious opinion in the maintenance and support of the Established Church, and its rights and privileges in relation to the State—particularly as regards all questions affecting its welfare likely to become the subject of legislative action; and generally to encourage the co-operation of Clergy and Laity, in their several districts, for the promotion of measures conducive to the welfare of the Church.' The Primate is president of the Institution, while the Archbishop of York, with the other English bishops, are its vice-presidents. Besides which, a very large number of influential laymen, including many Peers and Members of Parliament, irrespective of political bias, are on its executive committee. Owing to its continued vigilance and enterprise the external enemies of the Church are kept well in check, and the clergy are consequently less distracted from their spiritual ministrations. The disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church gave a fresh impulse to the antagonists of National Christianity, and in 1871 a motion for dealing with the English Church in similar fashion was brought into the House of Commons. It was rejected by 374 votes to 89, a majority of 285. Undaunted by defeat the motion was reintroduced in 1872, but the minority who supported it had dwindled down to 61, while the majority against it had increased to 295. It was clear that the citadel was too strong to be brought low, so the enemies changed their tactics. It occurred to them that Wales was once a separate nation, and then had an independent Church; they therefore proceeded to agitate for dealing with religious affairs in Wales

apart from England, notwithstanding that the Nations and Churches have been one and indivisible for centuries. Fortunately they have not been able to disguise their ultimate designs, and when Churchmen become fully sensible of the great wrong that is intended they will not hesitate to combine against its committal.

10. Lawsuits respecting Doctrine and Ritual.—As it forms no part of the object of this book to discuss matters of doctrine we may briefly pass over the party strifes within the Church, which have engendered unseemly lawsuits, by enumerating the chief results. *The Tractarian Movement* to which we shall refer in the next chapter, had led many to desire and institute a more ornate ceremonial and symbolism in public worship than their immediate forefathers cared about, or even dreamed of; and many earnest-minded men were so scandalised by the so-called ‘innovations’ that they determined to go to law against their brethren, ‘and test the legality of such proceedings.’ Had Convocation been able to act it is possible that such extreme measures might have been avoided, but a few aggrieved persons commenced them, and there has been a constant recurrence of actions at law ever since. The first case of the kind occurred in 1853-6, when legal proceedings were taken against *Archdeacon Denison*, on account of his published statements respecting the mode of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. In the event, Archdeacon Denison was sentenced to be deprived of his benefices; but the long discussion of the case compelled a more perfect study of the Church’s Sacramental doctrines. Following this case was that of *Westerton v. Liddell* respecting alleged ritual at St. Paul’s, Knightsbridge, and St. Barnabas, Pimlico. It was taken first to the Consistory Court of London, and decided against Mr. Liddell, who appealed to the Arches Court but without success. He then appealed to the Queen in Council, and obtained a more favourable decision; the result of which was that Ritualism was greatly encouraged. The expenses connected with these lawsuits were very great. It was known that the prosecutors in these cases had been ‘backed up’ by the *Evangelical Alliance*; and therefore, in 1859, *The English Church Union* was founded “mainly to defend and maintain unimpaired the Doctrine, Discipline, and Ritual of the Church of England against Erastianism, Rationalism and Puritanism; and to afford counsel and protection to all persons, Lay or Clerical, suffering unjust aggression or hindrance in spiritual matters.”¹ Archdeacon Denison was one of its promoters. Some ‘Evangelicals’ met this new organisation by founding the *Church Association*, A.D. 1865, in order “to counteract the efforts now being made to pervert the teaching of the Church of England on essential points of the Christian faith, or assimilate her services to those of the Church of Rome; and to

¹ From the English Church Union Directory, 1888.

effect these objects by publicity through Lectures, Meetings, and the use of the Press ; by appeals to the Courts of Law to ascertain what the law is, and by appeals to Parliament.¹” In other words, two avowedly partisan societies were started, the one to resist and the other to promote the interference of the law in the case of alleged breaches of the Reformation Settlement. The prosecutions were promoted by the Church Association, and the E.C.U. defended the ritual practices which their opponents considered illegal innovations. The excitement was then intense throughout the land, and mob riots against the surplice were frequent. In 1867, but without reference to Convocation, a bill was introduced to the House of Lords by the Earl of Shaftesbury, ‘to regulate the worship of the Church of England.’ This was a distinct violation of Church privileges, but happily the bill was negatived. A Royal Commission consisting of 14 clergy and 15 laymen was then appointed at the suggestion of Mr. Gladstone to consider the rubrics and their proper interpretation. It made several reports, two of which suggested speedy and inexpensive remedies for such parishioners as were aggrieved by ritual innovations. Several Ritual prosecutions had been in progress during the deliberations of the Ritual Commission. In 1867-8 the Revs. Mackonochie and Simpson were prosecuted in the Provincial Court of Arches, under the Church Discipline Act (which had been passed in 1840 to facilitate the hearing of complaints against the Clergy) and Sir R. Phillimore delivered judgment in their favour. The promoters of the suits appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and obtained a reversal of the judgment. But the decision of that Committee on a matter involving doctrine and ritual was not thought binding by the clergy most concerned, and the practices continued. In 1869 the celebrated *Purchas* case was before the Arches Court ; and the learned judge decided that the judgment of the Queen in Council *in re Westerton v. Liddell* held good, and that the ornaments of the churches and vestments of the clergy mentioned in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. were allowable. This judgment also was brought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on appeal and reversed ; but as before the decisions of the latter Court were openly disregarded. In 1874, and in the teeth of a protest made in the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation, a *Public Worship Regulation Act* was passed in Parliament, by which a layman was made the Official Principal of a new Arches Court instead of the judges who had hitherto been appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in their provincial Courts of Arches. After this Act was passed (March 1, 1875) the Bishops issued a joint Pastoral against “the refusal to obey legitimate authority” and “the dissemination of doctrines and encouragement of practices repugnant to the teaching of Holy Writ and to the principles of the Church as derived from

1 From the Church Association Tracts, 1833.

Apostolic times, and as authoritatively set forth at the Reformation." In 1875-6 the new Court had before it the case of *Clifton v. Ridsdale*, in which the new judge decided against the defendant clergyman. On the latter's appeal to the Final Court some modifications were made in the decrees of the Court of Arches, but by no means to the satisfaction of Ritualists. There has ever since been a bitter antagonism on their part against lay interference in clerical offences, and it is well known that several clergymen have preferred to go to prison rather than admit the jurisdiction of the new Court. The Reports of the Royal Commission referred to on the previous page, which were intended to meet the difficulties felt in reference to ecclesiastical suits, have not found favour with either class of disputants; nor have they yet been made the subject of further legislation.



THE NEW LAW COURTS, LONDON.

11. The Revival of Convocation.—Before the strictly Ritual prosecutions were commenced difficulties had arisen in connection with the Sacrament of Holy Baptism. In 1849 the Rev. G. C. Gorham was refused institution to a benefice by Dr. Philpotts, bishop of Exeter, on the ground that he held unorthodox opinions respecting the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. The clergyman proceeded against the bishop in the old Court of Arches, but lost his cause. He then appealed to Her Majesty in Council, where a number of lay judges decided in his favour, after consultation with several prelates who were also members of the Privy Council. The bishop recorded a solemn protest against this decision, and endeavoured to revive Convocation as the true court of appeal. Failing in this he called a Synod of the

clergy of his own diocese (1851); and the discussions that ensued therein not only made the doctrine of the Church of England more clear, but proved the necessity and advantage of reviving the synodical action of the Church. A movement for its revival had been on foot for some time. After the General Election of 1847, when Convocation had, as usual, been elected, the Lower House of the Canterbury province took the very unusual step of discussing amendments to the loyal address in reply to the Queen's message by which it had been called together. This ended in a petition to Her Majesty that the advice of the Church's ancient synod should be sought and taken by the Crown. All other religious bodies were allowed to have their deliberative assemblies; and in the midst of this general freedom the Church of England alone was unable to make its voice heard. A 'Society for the Revival of Convocation' was next started (1850), which made it its business to explain throughout the country, by public meetings and pamphlets, the historical right of the Church to its representative synodical action. There was an important debate in the House of Lords in 1851, which greatly advanced the cause; and at last it was found that, although Convocation had only been a name for over 130 years, there was really no legal hindrance to its discussion of any ecclesiastical question; although it could not issue any new canons or constitutions without the concurrence of the civil legislature and the assent of the Crown. The general election of 1852 was of course accompanied by a general election of proctors for Convocation, and those who were chosen to represent the province of Canterbury met in St. Paul's Cathedral, Nov. 5, 1852. One of its earliest acts was to make an energetic protest against the new papal hierarchy, in which it placed on record the historical position of our National Church, by designating the new departure as 'That fresh aggression of the Bishop of Rome, by which he has arrogated to himself the spiritual charge of this nation, thereby denying the existence of that branch of the Church Catholic which was planted in Britain in the primitive ages of Christianity, and has been preserved by a merciful Providence unto this day.' Although it took Convocation some little time to find its way along forgotten paths and resume its natural voice, the history of Convocation since its revival will furnish material for much encouragement to Churchmen. Our limited space forbids us to enumerate or discuss much that it has done; but one or two of its most important struggles on behalf of Church Doctrine and discipline may be mentioned. In 1860 a remarkable collection of articles were published under the title of *Essays and Reviews*, most of which were written by clergy; and all of which attacked some point of Christian belief. They attracted a great amount of attention and petitions were showered upon Convocation against their sceptical character. Over 8,000 clergy signed a formal protest against the articles and Convocation formally condemned them. (A.D. 1864.)

About the same time Dr. Colenso, the bishop of Natal, had thrown much doubt upon portions of the Holy Scriptures by commentaries which he had written, for which he had been condemned by the Episcopal Synod of South Africa and deprived of his bishopric. Convocation warmly thanked the South African Synod for the noble stand that it had made (the English bishops and proctors of Convocation had censured the writings long before); and when Dr. Colenso persisted in claiming to exercise the episcopal office, and was formally excommunicated by the Synod of Cape Town, the English Convocation upheld its vigorous and unflinching zeal.¹

It would not be right to pass over without mention the further development of the Church's united action outside of Convocation. In 1861 a valuable movement was set on foot at Cambridge by which clergy and laity might meet together to discuss Church matters publicly and freely. It was called a *Church Congress*; and the attempt was so successful that it has been repeated every year until now, and has assumed remarkable proportions. The chief originator of these annual gatherings was Archdeacon Emery, who has ever since taken a foremost part in all movements for uniting the clergy and laity. In 1863, he suggested to Convocation that each diocese should hold an annual Synod or Conference, representative of clergy and laity. The first synod of this character was held in the diocese of Ely (A.D. 1864); and now the growth and spread of these *Diocesan Conferences* is on all hands acknowledged to have been a most valuable adjunct to the work of the English Church. The latest development of the modern movement to revive the ancient practice of admitting the faithful laity to a share in the deliberations of the Church of England is to be found in the *House of Laymen*; which came into being by resolution of Convocation, July 1885, and held its first session at the National Society's rooms, Feb. 16, 1886. It is to hold its sessions during the time that Convocation is sitting; to be convened by the primate only; and be a consultative body with the clergy in Convocation on all subjects save the definition or interpretation of the faith and doctrine of the Church. It is anticipated that much good will result to the Church of England from this addition to her councillors. It is now in contemplation to provide a suitable place for the deliberation of these assemblies, to be called *The Church House*. It is also intended to be a lasting memorial of the progress made in Church work during the beneficent reign of Queen Victoria; and will afford accommodation for many other auxiliary agencies, and recognised Church Societies, which have made modern Church enterprise possible.


1 A lengthy account of the good work done by Convocation since its revival will be found in Canon Perry's *Students' Church History*, Vol. III., John Murray, 7s.6d.

CHAPTER XXIX. (A.D. 1811-1888).

MODERN CHURCH WORK.

“The time
Is conscious of her want; through England's bounds
In rival haste, the wished-for Temples rise!
I hear their Sabbath bells' harmonious chimes
Float on the breeze—the heavenliest of all sounds
That hill or vale prolongs or multiplies.”—*Wordsworth.*

1. Missionary Enterprise.—In a list of “Missionary enterprises to the Non-Christian world”—published in the *Record* newspaper (June 8, 1888), it appears that Greater Britain supports 113 missions—while all the rest of the Christian world put together can only support 110. Of this latter number the United States are credited with 56, so that English races support 169 out of 223 missions. Of the remainder, Denmark and Russia contribute two each, while France is represented by a solitary mission to S. Africa. The 169 ‘English’ missions are supported by many different ‘denominations,’ but the avowedly Episcopalian are the most important, most influential, most extensive, and most numerous. The Church of England has led the van in missionary enterprises all



BISHOP PATTESON'S HOUSE AND CHAPEL.

along, and has done most to create for our country the paramount position indicated by these figures. We have already referred to the beginnings of her two great missionary societies, and in the concluding chapter we shall deal with the growth of the missionary episcopate. The life of an evangelist to the heathen is one of hardship, suffering, and not seldom of death; as the records of the societies which send them forth abundantly testify. Two modern instances of noble self-sacrifice in the mission field must serve as examples. In 1841, *George Selwyn* was consecrated to be the bishop of New Zealand. Just before he left England to look after that distant country he preached at New Windsor on the blessedness of missionary work. His sermon made a great impression on a young Eton boy, *John Coleridge Patteson*, who then began to desire such a life of earnest devotion in the cause of Christ. When Bishop Selwyn came back for money and men in 1854 that Eton boy had become a clergyman; and the next year he accompanied the bishop to the far-off islands of the Pacific, and worked among the Maories in Melanesia; visiting the islands in a little ship called 'The Southern Cross.' In 1861 he was consecrated to be the bishop over the missions he had helped to found, and for ten years he worked with such noble devotion that 'his praise was in all the Churches.' Our illustration shows his primitive Melanesian home for which he had given up luxury in England. But an abominable trade in coolie labour for the Queensland plantations had created distrust of white men among the inhabitants of one of the islands, and as the Southern Cross was the first vessel to call there after a party of traders had kidnapped five of the islanders, the tribe took a terrible revenge by murdering Bishop Patteson as soon as he had landed, and mortally wounding two of his companions. The natives wrapped the Bishop's body in a mat, into the folds of which they thrust a palm branch with five knots tied in it, to signify that the deed was an avengement of their five stolen friends. They then put the body in a canoe and let it drift out to sea, whence it was picked up by the ship's boat. In Australia and England the tidings of his death were received with an emotion that is rarely witnessed. 'The Queen's Speech at the opening of Parliament in 1872 alluded to the tragic end of so noble a life.' The S.P.G. raised worthy memorials to his life and death by building a church on Norfolk Island and a new mission ship. The second example of a modern bishop whose life was sacrificed by barbarians, is that of *James Hannington*, who went to Eastern Equatorial Africa, under the auspices of the C.M.S. in 1882; and was consecrated bishop at the instance of that society in 1885; a mission ship being built to cruise on Lake Nyanza. In October of that same year he made an attempt to open up a short route to Buganda, where a mission station had been planted through the instrumentality of the great explorer, Mr. H. M. Stanley; but when within four days' journey of his destination his caravan was

seized upon by the Masai tribes at Busoga, and detained until King Mwanga should send word from Buganda as to whether they might go forward. Mwanga's reply was that they should be killed; and accordingly the whole party were put to death, save three native servants who escaped to tell the tale. Bishop Hannington's last words were: "Tell the king I am about to die for the Buganda, and have purchased the road to them with my life." Two years later, the news arrived that the king Mwanga had been baptised, and Buganda is now a Christian state. Bishop Hannington's episcopate was too short for great achievements, but the way he opened up, and the mission stations he planted on the route, complete a circle of Christian outposts in 'The Dark Continent,' which will hereafter subdue its savage inhabitants to the peace of God.

2. The Church Revival.

—One of the early Colonial bishops was Reginald Heber, who became second bishop of Calcutta in 1823. Before then he had been rector of Hodnet, in Shropshire. He is, however, best known as a great Christian poet, and there is this difference between his writings and those of the 18th century poets: that whereas they entirely ignored the systematic grouping of Christian doctrines which the Church provides in the orderly arrangement of seasons of fasting and rejoicing; he followed in the steps of George Herbert by showing, that there is real beauty and harmony in the course laid out for us by the early Christian Fathers. Who that rightly sings his grand hymn for St. Stephen's Day:—

'The Son of God goes forth to War'



BISHOP HEBER.

can help being moved to do something for the cause of our Redeemer. And when we chant his Epiphany carol:—

'Brightest and best of the sons of the morning,'

how can we help being awed at the wondrous condescension of the

Lord of Glory? Again, are not our hearts filled with adoring love when at Holy Communion we sing:—

‘Bread of the world in mercy broken’?

And who can estimate the good that has been done for the heathen, or count the myriads who have been led to think of them, by his simple strains first sung in Wrexham Church:—

‘From Greenland’s icy mountains’?

It is not too much to say that the publication of Reginald Heber’s hymns inspired *John Keble* to write the ‘Christian Year;’ than which, perhaps, no book has done more to make men and women love the English Liturgy and to see that, by the wisdom of the Fathers,

“The way before us lies


Distinct with signs—through which, in fixed career

As through a Zodiac, moves the ritual year

Of England’s Church.”

From the time the ‘Christian Year’ was published (A.D. 1827) we are able to trace a gradual return to a reverence for ecclesiastical order and the Customs of the primitive Church which, since the Commonwealth, had fallen into decay. Mr. Keble was in the forefront of this new revival, and from his position as Professor of Poetry, he was an accepted leader among the knot of Fellows and students of the University of Oxford who concurred in the necessity of impressing on people that the Church was more than a merely human institution; that it had privileges, sacraments, and a ministry ordained by Christ; that it was a matter of the highest obligation, not only to remain united to the Church, but also to use her formularies loyally. There were grave reasons why that ‘Association of Friends of the Church,’ was greatly needed. The repeal of the Test Acts (1828), by which other than communicant members of the National Church were eligible for State offices; and the removal of Roman Catholic disabilities (1829); together with the enquiries made (at the instance of the Parliament returned on the first Reform Bill) respecting the unequal distribution of Church property, that led to the formation of the Ecclesiastical Commission (1836); made Churchmen anxious for such privileges as were left to them: especially the Liturgy, which was being attacked by the Church’s own children with a view to drastic changes. The leaders of the Oxford movement drew up memorials, which were signed by thousands of clergy and hundreds of thousands of heads of families, to the primate and the king, so that the country was able to see how much our formularies were loved. The actual originator of the movement was Hugh James Rose, and the centre of it was at *Oriel College*, to which, from all parts of the country, Churchmen went to enquire as of an oracle. The Oxford friends tried to stimulate the good feeling thus aroused by the circulation of cheap literature on Church matters, called ‘Tracts for the Times’; which occasionally defeated the ends aimed at by their

sudden boldness, and not seldom by their exaggerated language and mediæval sentiments. The Church was startled by this recall to principles which had been neglected for two hundred years, and endeavoured to silence the 'Tractarians' by condemning some of their writings and pulpit utterances. Certain leaders were suspended, but the movement went on. This is not the place, even if there were room, to discuss the *pros* and *cons* of the revival teaching. As has been the case all through these pages, opinions are only mentioned to show the lasting effects they produced. The good commenced by such men as H. J. Rose, W. F. Percival, Edward Pusey, William Palmer, Isaac Williams, and John Keble, has been felt chiefly in the greater attention since paid by all schools of thought to fundamentals of faith and practice; but it is right to state that several of their companions were led to seek a more congenial sphere, beyond the borders of our Church. Among these may be mentioned Edward Manning, and John Henry Newman, who seceded to the Church of Rome in 1845, and were afterwards made Cardinals. Their example induced a great many ladies and gentlemen to take a similar step. While the secessions were going on Romanists were in great delight, and fondly hoped that England would soon be brought into obedience to the papacy. Many Englishmen on the other hand expected that the secessions would put an end to the Oxford movement. Neither hope was realised. Mr. Keble, Dr. Pusey, and other leaders proved their honest intent by strict fidelity to the Church of their fathers; and lived to gain respect even from some of their opponents. And there can be no doubt whatever that the movement they fostered, with all its defects, compelled greater reverence for Apostolic doctrine and fellowship, and did more than anything else to bring the Church of England into its present high state of efficiency and usefulness. The Tractarians were the extreme wing of the modern "High Church" party. Between them and the "Low Church" party were a vast body of many moderate men, of whom *Dr. Christopher Wordsworth*, bishop of Lincoln, and *Dean Hook*, whose name is still a household word in the great town of Leeds, where he had been vicar, were worthy examples.



THE REV. JOHN KEBLE.

3. Religious Education of the Young.—Although their foundation dates from the middle of the Georgian era, we have refrained from mentioning the good work done by *Sunday Schools* until now, because their continuance and development occupies a foremost place in 'Modern Church Work.' They came into general notice about 1781, chiefly through the combined instrumentality of Mr. Raikes, a worthy tradesman of Gloucester, and Mr. Stoek, one of the clergy of that city. Not very long after they obtained the approval of Dr. Porteus, the bishop of London. Like all new movements, Sunday-schools met with a measure of opposition at the first; and it must be admitted that, if proper advantage had been taken of the Church's provision for catechising the young, they would not have been so much needed; but the apathy and neglect which had overspread Church work during the 18th century was felt by the children most of all. But when the 19th century dawned Sunday-schools became acknowledged as an indispensable adjunct of Church work, with the cordial approval of the S.P.C.K., which had always been anxious for the religious training of the young. At the present time it would be impossible to calculate the good that they are doing. A recent 'Royal Commission on Elementary Education,' the report of which was published in August, 1888, received evidence on the subject from the official representatives of three Sunday-school associations, from which we learn that the number of scholars on the rolls of the Sunday-schools in England and Wales was then 5,200,000 of all denominations. But of this number over a million were infants under seven years of age; and in many cases, especially in Wales and among the Society of Friends, the Sunday-schools are largely attended by adults. There seems to be no information available as to the number of children cared for by Romanists on Sundays; but it was estimated that the numbers of scholars in Church and Dissenting Sunday-schools in the year 1888, between the ages of seven and fourteen, in England and Wales, were as follows:—

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Church of England | 1,540,000 |
| Wesleyan and Methodist | 445,500 |
| In connection with the Sunday School Union ... | 587,500 |
| Other 'Protestant' Denominations | 600,000 |
| Total No. of Scholars between 7 and 14 | 3,173,000 |

It is surely not too much to say that the instruction these myriads of children receive in the elements of Christian belief does immense good to the country at large, notwithstanding the fact that the majority of their Sunday-school teachers have had no special training for their office. In 1888 there were 224,750 teachers in the Church of England Sunday-schools; and the scholars of all ages under their care numbered no less than 2,555,399.¹

¹ These figures are taken from Mr. Palmer's Manual on the *History of Sunday Schools*, published by the Sunday School Institute, Serjeant's Inn, E.C.

Even more important than the Sunday-schools is the work done by the Elementary Day-schools of the Church of England. Reference was made on page 200 to the charity school system which the S.P.C.K. had organised at the beginning of the 18th century; but after a hundred years of useful work in that direction, it was felt that primary education of the young, on a sound religious basis, demanded that a separate society should be formed to take in hand the organisation of parochial Church schools. Up to that time the government had not felt any responsibility touching the instruction of youth; and in spite of what the S.P.C.K. had done, together with the private adventures of individuals, nearly two-thirds of the children of poor parents were left without the merest rudiments of English knowledge, save that which was imparted here and there by incompetent dames. However, in 1811, the 'National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church' was founded; which soon extended its influence over the whole kingdom, until there was hardly a parish without its National School. A little healthy rivalry among the few beneficent men who were interested in the question probably hastened the formation of the National Society; but since it has been founded no one has been able to say with truth that Churchmen have not the cause of Elementary Education at heart. Until the reign of William IV. voluntary beneficence was the only means by which instruction could be imparted to the children of the poor; and even then what the State did was infinitesimal. In 1833 the House of Commons was persuaded to set aside £20,000 a year for elementary education in England. In 1839 a Committee of Council was appointed to deal specially with the question, and administer the government grants; and from that time the subsidies rapidly increased. The Church was then educating eleven children out of every twelve receiving instruction, and successfully resisted a mean attempt on the part of the Committee of Council to ignore distinctive religious training. Until 1870 the government grants were distributed among the denominational schools, but in that year it will be remembered that the 'Elementary Education Act' was passed, by which Parliament separated itself from all concern in definite religious instructions, and provided for the establishment of undenominational schools under Local Boards; its grants being distributed in proportion to the proficiency of each child in the rudiments of secular knowledge. The difference between the government grants and the gross cost of maintenance in the Board-schools has to be provided by the local ratepayers, according to the valuation fixed from time to time by the School Boards they have elected. But the difference between the government grants and the cost of maintenance in the denominational schools, has to be supplied by the voluntary contributions of their friends: who have also had to pay their quota to the School

Board rate. Voluntary schools therefore are heavily handicapped ; nevertheless, so great is the acknowledgment of the necessity of definite religious instruction that voluntary schools continue to flourish, as the following tables demonstrate.

Voluntary Expenditure on Church Schools & Training Colleges.

| Object of Expenditure. | 1811-1870. | 1870-1890. | Total. |
|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | £ | £ | £ |
| Building Schools..... | *6,270,577 | 6,845,512 | 13,116,089 |
| Maintenance of Ditto | 8,500,000 | 12,180,493 | 20,680,493 |
| Building Training Colleges | 194,085 | 83,310 | 277,395 |
| Maintenance of Ditto..... | 185,276 | 284,454 | 469,730 |
| Grand Totals..... | 15,149,938 | 19,393,769 | 34,543,707 |

* These figures are exclusive of the value of sites, which are often free gifts in the case of Voluntary Schools. This would increase the total expenditure by at least a million pounds.

Elementary Day School Statistics for the year ending Aug. 31, 1890.

| Denomination. | Accommodation. | No. on Registers. | Average Attendances. | Voluntary Contributions. |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Church of Eng.... | 2,651,078 | 2,168,229 | 1,680,596 | £589,640 14 1 |
| British, &c. | 416,253 | 329,732 | 254,873 | 79,723 5 9 |
| Wesleyan | 214,819 | 174,773 | 131,805 | 17,253 1 5 |
| Romanist | 341,953 | 255,777 | 193,285 | 70,911 10 9 |
| Board | 1,915,182 | 1,875,638 | 1,457,358 | |
| Total | 5,539,285 | 4,804,149 | 3,717,917 | £757,528 12 0 |

From such figures, which are published annually by the National Society at Westminster, it will be seen that although, since the Education Act of 1870, the Church has had to contend against the unlimited exchequer of Board schools, she has been able to hold her own as the teacher of the poor ; for her schools, the accommodation therein, and the average attendance are nearly equal to all the Board schools, British schools, and Sectarian schools combined. In some counties the Church schools have an overwhelming preponderance,—*e.g.*, in the County of Essex, in 1888, there were under separate management 343 Church schools, 23 British, &c., 11 Wesleyan, 11 Romanist and 123 Board schools ; so that the Church of England has made itself responsible for about two-thirds of all the elementary day

schools in that county. In the face of very great disadvantages the results obtained in Church schools equal, and often exceed, the Board school results; and at much less cost per head. To which must be added the priceless boon of definite religious teaching. It is therefore a matter of great moment that Churchmen should maintain the Church's educational work; for, as a report of the National Society declared, "without religion, though it may be possible to instruct, it is not possible thoroughly to educate; and for religious teaching to be effectual it must be definite in character. When children are brought up in schools where religious teaching is vague and uncertain they not only fail to receive any deep impression for good, but are in danger of acquiring a general indifference towards religion."

4. Church Restoration.—The most remarkable of the marvellous developments of modern Church work is the decided change for the better in the general aspect of our parish churches. Most people now living can remember the dreary and dilapidated churches, of which there are a few still to be seen, but not very many. The architectural beauties of the buildings were disfigured by the flimsiest woodwork, plaster, and paint. Until 20 years ago all this was the rule rather than the exception. But the revived attention to Church history and antiquities has wrought a wonderful change; and for discomfort, want of cleanliness, and objectionable class distinctions, we now possess equality, uniformity, decency and orderly arrangement in our churches; which has greatly increased that spirit of reverence which ought never to be absent from our minds when we go to worship God. Our two comparative illustrations overleaf only imperfectly explain the different appearances worn by our churches now, because they are not the most telling examples that might have been shown. The 'unrestored chancel' represents the private chapel of a nobleman. The 'recently restored church' is one of the City of London churches built by Sir Christopher Wren, which once had quite a different aspect. The pulpit occupies a far less prominent position than it used to do; and a stranger would at once see that it is not so much a place where people come 'to hear Mr. So-and-so preach,' as a sanctuary into which men come seeking rest and refreshment from One who is no respecter of persons. Such a transformation has taken place in nearly every ancient parish church within the memory of many now living. More than eight thousand 'temples of God's grace'—beautiful for situation, the joy of countless generations in every part of the land, the living witnesses of past benevolence—have been made to rise again to newer life during the last 50 years. Within their walls for many centuries the voice of prayer and praise has ascended to the Throne of Grace from innumerable hearts. Some of them are in towns and cities where the hurry and bustle of life cause us to pass them by with very little thought or care (save for the value of their sites, for the

best and most ancient will generally be found in the busiest parts); but the greater number are in out of the way villages, surrounded by equally old and older churchyards, where the ancestry of the neighbourhood and relatives of the parishioners lie buried, who once worshipped therein. Sometimes new churches have had to be built, because the old had been allowed to go altogether to decay; but the stones of the old are often bound up in the new buildings, the religious history of the parishes remaining, while the love



AN UNRESTORED CHANCEL.

of the parishioners for such sanctuaries is most cordial. Modern adversaries of the Church of England desire that all these ancient churches (all, in fact, that were founded before the year 1818) should be taken out of the possession of the present holders and vested in Parochial Boards, to be elected by the rate-payers, which should have power to use them for secular purposes, and even to sell them. It is not difficult to imagine that some parishes (where there are a majority of Nonconformists, or Jews, or foreign colonists) would elect representatives to such a board who would arbitrarily use

the proposed power to the detriment of Church interests. It is unlikely that such a proposition would be generally carried out; but we know what pressure has been put upon national schools in certain parishes, by which many have been lost to the Church. We must therefore carefully watch every new proposal of the enemy, and provide ourselves with defensive armour. Fortunately there is latent in the breasts of most Englishmen a mighty horror of sacrilege. In some places it has been found difficult even for the restorers to avoid

opposition to schemes of restoration. If men are found jealous when loving hands propose to move the crumbling stones we may be sure that they would still more resent the sacrilegious profanation of Liberationists. Churchmen in every part of England cherish similar feeling. 'They think of the Cathedrals and their glory; of the little village churches and their sweetness; of the bells that—from every steeple, tower, and turret—chime o'er hill and dale; of the means of grace offered within these sanctuaries to all who desire them, no matter how lowly or exalted their rank; and they determine that the privileges they have inherited shall not be lost. From the cradle to the grave they and theirs have been, and are being ministered to by God's appointed stewards; and therefore they are desirous that in the days that are coming there still may be her blessings offered to every babe, her open gates and inviting altars, her benediction for every bridal, her visits of sympathy and instruction for every sick room, her words of hope for every grave, and the music of her Prayer-book echoing near each one of us daily and nightly.'—*(Bishop Alexander.)*



RECENTLY RESTORED CHURCH.

If we were to allow these priceless heritages—which our forefathers built and handed down to us in trust for our posterity—to be surrendered to irreligious clamour, how could we expect to retain the friendship of God to whose glory they have been erected? What would the world say of us if we gave them up? There are many English speaking countries which would give anything they now enjoy to have such memorials of the picty of bygone ages as we possess. They even claim a share in them as they are, and would bitterly reproach us if we took no care of them. We should become a by-word among our kinsmen in other lands if we were to stand idly by, and make no effort to restrain the unbridled covetousness of those who are agitating for the alienation to secular uses of our old parish churches. But there is not much danger that

this will ever be allowed. Our statesmen are realising that any attempt to misuse, or destroy, or despoil these old historic places, will cause them to forfeit the confidence of Englishmen.

5. Increase of the Clergy.¹—The chief difficulty with which the Church has had to cope in modern times has been the remarkably rapid increase in the population of towns and cities. 'They grow at a rate that will not admit of the slightest relaxation of effort to supply its spiritual necessities; nay, that demands increased exertion.' The only way of meeting the need was by adding to the number of churches and clergy. And this has been done in two ways: by abolishing the holding of more than one benefice by individual clergymen, except in special cases; and by providing assistant clergy to help the incumbents of populous parishes, who are generally known as 'Curates.'² "Curates there were, it is true, in former times; but they were merely the representatives of the incumbents, who, holding two or more benefices together, were non-resident. So extensively did this state of things prevail, that in the year 1810, from Parliamentary returns of the 10,159 livings held by incumbents, more than half of the parishes were supplied by curates-in-sole-charge. After the passing of the Pluralities Act this state of things became gradually changed. Hence, in 1838 some 3,078 curates-in-charge acted for non-resident incumbents; in 1864 only 955 so acted; in 1890 only 228. The ability to provide for these additional clergy and their helpers comes mainly from two societies:—The Church Pastoral Aid Society, which was founded February 19th, 1836; and the Additional Curates' Society which came into being the following year. In 1831 there were 13,994,460 persons in England and Wales. In 1881 there were 26,117,886. But as in 1831 there were 980,750 agricultural labourers in the country, and only 870,798 in 1881, it follows that the labouring classes must have migrated to the urban districts; so that, although the spiritual necessities of rural neighbourhoods might be met by compelling the residence of incumbents, the vast masses of the people in towns could only be reached by employing more clergy. The following comparison will show what efforts have been made in this direction.

| | 1836. | 1890. |
|---|--------|--------|
| No. of benefices in England and Wales | 10,657 | 14,116 |
| No. of beneficed clergy | 8,147 | 13,747 |
| No. of curates employed by <i>resident</i> incumbents | 1,006 | 6,457 |
| No. of curates employed by <i>non-resident</i> incumbents | 4,224 | 228 |
| Average annual stipend of assistant clergy ... | £81 | £140? |

¹ These particulars have been gathered from Reports of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, the Additional Curates' Society, and the *Official Year Books* of the Church of England, published annually by S.P.C.K.

² According to the Prayer-book, Incumbents are the 'Curates,' for they have the 'cure' or care of souls. The application of the term to assistant clergy is modern.

About 750 clergy are now ordained every year. Up to 1816 the Universities were the only sources from which clergy could be drawn; but in that year a Theological College was founded at St. Bees, Cumberland, for the exclusive training of candidates for Holy Orders, who for various reasons were unable to go to Oxford or Cambridge, and this foundation has sent out a very large number of clergy, chiefly into the poorer districts, as Home Missionaries. In 1831 King's College, London, was opened for instruction in Church of England doctrines and duties, combined with other branches of useful education; as a set off to the purely secular London University which had been founded just before; and this also has furnished a goodly number of clergy. In 1832 the University of Durham was founded, with a theological department, for the sake of

men who, though unable to avail themselves of the older Universities, were willing to qualify for degrees. The success of St. Bees' College during a quarter of a century prompted the revival of Theological seminaries in connexion with some of the cathedral foundations. Hence Chichester in 1839—followed by Wells, Lichfield, Salisbury, Gloucester, Lincoln, Ely, and



ARMS OF KING'S COLLEGE.

Truro, in the order named—established training homes for clergy; chiefly to provide more definite and special theological training than a university course supplies. There are several other theological colleges, founded to perpetuate distinct schools of thought, such as Birkenhead, Cuddesdon, Highbury, Wycliffe Hall at Oxford and Ridley Hall in Cambridge. During the last 19 years, *i.e.* 1872-1891, there have been 14,204 new clergy ordained for England and Wales; and they have been drawn from the following educational centres:—Cambridge, 4,324; Oxford, 4,142; Theological Colleges, 3,706; Durham, 825; Dublin, 571; besides which 636 have been ordained as 'Literates,' who satisfied the bishops examining chaplains as to their intellectual attainments without attending any special training institution. There are also several colleges for training foreign missionaries, such as the C.M.S. College at Islington, St. Augustine's at Canterbury (see vol. I, p. 57), and some smaller institutions.

6. Church Building.—The large number of new parishes recently formed, wherein additional churches have been built; to

bring the outward means of grace nearer to the people who have been crowded out of the older centres of population, and make better accommodation for districts that have outgrown the ancient provision; is an all sufficient testimony that the National Church is fully alive to the necessities laid upon her. The 'Incorporated Church Building Society' reports that from its foundation in 1818 up to the year 1892, it has shared in the erection of 2,151 new churches, and in the rebuilding, enlarging, or otherwise improving the accommodation in 5,846 existing churches. By these means 1,898,160 additional seats were obtained, of which 1,548,661 were set



A MODERN CHURCH AND NATIONAL SCHOOL.

apart for the free use of the parishioners. A parliamentary return published in 1875 showed that between the years 1840 and 1874 the amount expended in church building and restoration, *not counting sums under £500*, was £25,548,703. A statement in the 'Official Year Book' for 1888, shows that during the 10 years 1877 to 1886, no less than 809 new churches have been built and consecrated, and 2,572 old churches restored; and the same publication states that during the 25 years ending 1884, *exclusive of what has been done through Church Societies*, the marvellous sum of £35,175,000 has been voluntarily contributed by Churchmen; towards building new, and restoring old churches and parsonages, and towards endowments for the support of the clergy. The various societies established for these and kindred purposes have contributed in addition £7,426,478

during the same period of 25 years. These returns only account for the *known* liberality of Churchmen. There is besides a vast amount of secret benevolence for which no accounts can be furnished. Up to the year 1860 there was no attempt to estimate the modern liberality and enterprise of the National Church; but they are probably well within the mark who estimate that during the first 50 years of Queen Victoria's beneficent reign over £50,000,000 were spent in the single item of Church building and restoration, apart from endowments or stipends to the clergy; and that over 4,000 new churches have been built to meet the increased spiritual requirements of the age. The illustration we have given of a modern church, with school attached, is an example which might be multiplied a thousand-fold, of the efforts made by the Church of England to keep abreast of the times. If it were not for her efforts many places would be without any spiritual ministrations whatever, especially in villages remote from towns, where the inhabitants are poor. A searching enquiry (made 1886) in one English county (Somerset), showed that out of 520 parishes, there were no less than 195 where no public religious worship or instruction was provided, except that of the Church of England; and that in 400 of those 520 parishes there were no resident ministers of any religious denomination except the clergy of the Church of England. The same enquiry showed that the parishes wherein other religious bodies do provide accommodation, and living agents, are all among the larger and richer populations; and in those cases not one, but often several different bodies were to be found, dividing up the people into hostile religious camps. The 195 parishes in Somersetshire where the Church of England stands alone are all sparsely inhabited, difficult of access, and sadly deficient in pecuniary resources. We do not want a better example than these figures provide of the necessity for maintaining the Church of England in her present position of usefulness; apart from the further need of her continuance as 'an ensign for the people,' and the emblem of unity and comprehension. If the Church were disestablished and disendowed, nearly all these 195 parishes would be precluded from obtaining those spiritual ministrations by which for centuries the isolated inhabitants have worshipped in common with their fellow-countrymen. So much for the villages; but what of the poor and densely-populated towns? How few whose spiritual privileges are ready to hand ever think of the difficulties that beset a clergyman when he is set to work up a new district and build a church? Several years ago an exceeding great and bitter cry went up on behalf of teeming myriads of squalid semi-heathen poor in the congested parts of London. To meet his share of the responsibility the Bishop of Rochester appealed for funds to build ten new churches. In four years the task was completed. This looks simple and easy to say, but it was much harder to do. The writer has before him the particulars of the enormous work that was needed in order

to provide one of those ten churches, and it is a fair example of similar work all over England. A mission priest was sent into an over-populated district to teach the people what he could, and relieve the clergy in several parishes of a small share of their ministerial responsibility. A room in a Board school was first obtained for Sunday-school purposes, and on the first Sunday a solitary child presented herself; but before the Board school was given up over 1,100 children attended on the Sunday afternoons. Church services were begun in a small house, then the missionary obtained a tent, after that a mission building; and within five years from the commencement of the work a spacious church was built and consecrated; while, in addition to the £5,000 received from the 'Ten Churches Fund,' about £8,000 were raised to provide sites for church and parsonage (in this particular district land is very dear), and for building the parsonage and mission buildings. Seven hundred people can now worship comfortably in the church, and all the parish knows that anyone may go there whenever it is convenient, and sit where they please; for the church is free and open, and the seats are not appropriated.

7. Mission Work among the Poor.—Many poor and needy folk are averse to going to church at all, sometimes because they feel that their wearing apparel is incongruous, sometimes because the church is too far off for them to spare the time from work or domestic duties to attend a regular service; in other cases because the wife of a poor working man cannot leave her young family, and must either bring her little ones with her or stay away from worship altogether. To meet these difficulties, which are very real ones, mission buildings have been provided. From a recent inquiry it has been found that there are 4,717 permanent mission buildings, other than parish and district churches, in which services are systematically held, and accommodation provided for 843,273 poor persons (*Year Book*, 1888). In this and many other ways, which we cannot here enumerate, the Church of England strives to win the people to Christ. She goes down among the most degraded ones—in the haunts of misery, vice, and squalor—seeking to relieve their temporal and spiritual necessities. There is no corner of England outside the object of the Church's love and labour; neither is there any class, however high or low, however depraved or vicious, which the Church does not try to reach. By means of the parochial system, every inhabitant in our land is enabled to claim a share in the privileges of worship; and whether they will hear or no every incumbent is responsible for bringing within their reach the means by which their spiritual aspirations may be developed.

'Bulwark of a mighty nation, see the Church of England stand,
Founded on the Rock of Ages, hope and glory of our land.
Nursing mother of our freedom, sowing truth from door to door;
Watching o'er the young and aged, Church alike of rich and poor.'

One great want of rich and poor alike in our country is the need of a quiet place where they may 'go apart and rest awhile' from the cares and troubles that beset them. At home privacy is out of the question, and many Christian souls are hampered and hindered by the irreligious conduct of other members of their families. It is becoming more and more the rule to have our churches open at stated times during each day, even though there may not be services going on; and increasing use is made of the advantages thus offered for private meditation amid hallowed surroundings. The present Primate has recently taken counsel with influential churchmen with a view of still further extending this



'ADMISSIO N ROOM.'

privilege; and no one can doubt that it will be used with advantage, not only by the poor who need it most, but also by the very large number of business people who so often feel the need of mental refreshment such as only communion with God in prayer can give. As Archbishop Benson has said: "Many of our devout poor can find neither space nor quiet for the solitary closet prayer which 'The Father seeth.' For them the retirement of the spacious lonely church is the 'closet' of Christ. I have known it so, not only for them, but for the active young workman in his dinner hour. But not they only—many who have room enough and time enough have thanked God for giving them there, in still moments, refreshment, strength, and a deeper understanding of why 'His House is called

the House of Prayer.' The blessing of 'having a church to go to' would be multiplied if it had an open door all day; if it were so ordered as to have some look of a home; if it had quiet kneeling places. It would be not the House of Divine Service only, as it is, but the 'House of Prayer,' which our Lord desired that it should be."

Some further idea of the work and membership of the Church of England may be gleaned from the figures in the footnote; gathered chiefly from returns obtained for the *Official Year Book* and by the various Church Societies. But the figures given do not accurately set forth the full extent of most departments mentioned, owing to the difficulty in obtaining returns from the different parishes. All who are specially interested in such statistics should buy the Year Book annually. Truly may it be said 'Like a mighty army, moves the Church of God.' How can we help feeling that such work and worship is very beneficial to the welfare of our fatherland?

8. Finance.—When Churchmen think of the wondrous liberality of recent times, they will not find any cause for discouragement. Yet we cannot avoid the reflection that such good work for God and His Church would have been far less had it not been that the ancient provision for the maintenance of the clergy enabled the voluntary contributions to Churchmen in our own day to be appropriated to such extension and development. Those ancient endowments are the real objects of our adversaries' designs, and therefore we should take special steps to guard them. The Liberationist theory that pre-Reformation bequests were given for the support of all religions, because at that time there was only one in existence, is one of those daring violations of common sense whose very audacity occasionally ensures their triumph. The ancient endowments of the Church were given specifically to the various cathedrals, parish churches, and capitular bodies, to be used for their separate maintenance, that the localities benefited thereby might always enjoy ministerial service according to the use of the Church of England. Let us understand their extent. According to a return made to Parliament in 1890 the gross income of the Church from ancient endowments and modern benefactions amounted to £5,753,557; but as this is calculated upon the commutation value of tithe which dropped 25 per cent. during the 10 years ending 1891, and because incumbents are liable for

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1 Church accommodation in 1885:—Free, 3,664,429; Appropriated, 1,497,119= | 5,161,548 |
| Communicants on the Rolls or communicating on Easter Day, 1885 ... | 1,181,915 |
| Sunday School Teachers in 1888 ... | 224,750 |
| Sunday School Children of all ages in 1888 ... | 2,555,399 |
| Members of Bible Classes in 1885:—Male, 130,901; Female, 144,512 ...= | 275,413 |
| Number of Persons Baptised in 1885:—Infants, 450,794; Adults, 12,938= | 463,732 |
| Number of Persons Confirmed in 1891:—Males, 84,947; Females, 129,584= | 214,531 |
| Temperance Society Members (1885):—Juvenile, 318,156; Adult, 231,066= | 549,222 |
| Voluntary Choristers in 1885: Male, 153,079; Female, 18,991 ...= | 172,070 |
| Incumbents (Y. B. 1892), 13,747; Deputy and Assistant Clergy, 6,685 ...= | 20,432 |

repairs, taxes on land and houses, and pay more than half the stipends of the assistant curates the nett receipts barely reach three millions a year. Divide this among the 14,000 benefices, and an average income of little more than £200 per incumbent is the result. From the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' return for the year 1890, we learn that since their Commission Fund was created in 1840 they have augmented and endowed 5,700 benefices, at a yearly cost of £781,400, most of which is derived from tithe and glebe lands that the Commissioners have received for re-distribution; to meet which private benefactors have contributed additional sums amounting in the aggregate to no less than £164,340 a year.

Besides the contributions of Churchmen for Home and Foreign Missions, Church Building and Restoration, and Elementary Education; there are numerous other directions in which their liberality flows unceasingly. The training of clergy; middle class schools; charitable institutions of various kinds, such as Orphanages, Penitentiaries, and Reformatories; Nursing Institutions and Deaconess Homes; Cottage Hospitals and Convalescent Homes; all receive a very large share of the benevolence of Churchpeople. Then there are the current expenses of every church, to be met, at a cost of £600,000 a year; and the poor of each parish to be looked after, which requires and receives quite £500,000 a year more. In the matter of *Hospital Sunday* alone it is known that Churchmen in London subscribed £449,469 in the years 1873-1891; out of £587,502, the whole amount contributed by all denominations. The total voluntary contributions of the Church of England in the year 1885, which is the latest year for which complete returns are to hand, *exceed five millions of money*—nearly all of which is available for the general good, because Churchmen are comparatively free from anxiety in respect to the incomes of the beneficed clergy, owing to the endowments left to the Church in earlier ages. We now know that the work of the Church of England is too great and beneficial to the realm for it ever to cease being the chief religious body in the land. Her adversaries may approach to hurt her, but if her children are on guard they will approach in vain. Yet it is not alone for her material possessions that Churchmen care. They are all as nothing compared with her Apostolic character and her true Catholic doctrines. If these are let slip we have no anchor of hope remaining. It is hardly possible, however, that we shall let them go. Our Apostolical leaders were never more able and devoted than they are now; nor were they ever so numerous and united, as the concluding chapter will show. We call to them 'Watchmen, what of the night?' and they answer cheerily 'The morning cometh.'

CHAPTER XXX. (A.D. 1784-1838.)

THE EXTENSION OF THE EPISCOPATE.

"Look forth! that stream behold,
That stream upon whose bosom we have passed,
Floating at ease, while nations have effaced
Nations, and death has gathered to his fold
Long lines of mighty kings—Look forth, my soul!
(Nor in this vision be thou slow to trust)
The living waters, less and less by guilt
Stained and polluted, brighten as they roll."—*Wordsworth.*

I. **The American Episcopate.**—Although our attention has been chiefly directed to purely English affairs, it would be a grave error to omit all reference to the growth of the Anglican Church beyond the seas. For more than a century the Colonial clergy had been under the jurisdiction of the bishop of London, who appointed commissaries to enquire into their conduct. All attempts to form Colonial bishoprics met with chilling responses from the English statesmen, apart from whom the bishops could not act. The young were not confirmed, clergy could not be ordained without the expense and risk of long and dangerous voyages, and therefore the Church did not prosper abroad. Until 1776, when the transatlantic settlements declared their Independence, America was the fairest gem of all the British dependencies; but after a struggle of several years their Independence was acknowledged by England. Some of the American clergy had taken up the cause of Independence; those who were faithful to English rule were driven out of the revolutionary States; and at the close of the war the Church in America was at its lowest ebb. In Virginia alone, where there had been 164 churches and 91 clergy, only 28 clergy were left and 95 of the churches had been destroyed. As it was impossible for the bishop of London to have ecclesiastical jurisdiction over revolted States, a native Episcopate was more than ever imperatively necessary if the Anglican Episcopal Church in America was to continue its existence. The State of Connecticut was the first to move in the matter. The clergy elected one of their number, *Dr. Samuel Seabury*, as their bishop, and sent him to England for consecration. The English prelates could not consecrate him, however, because according to law all bishops were bound to take the oath of allegiance to the English crown; which Seabury, as the subject of a 'foreign' State, was unable to do. He therefore went to Scotland, at the suggestion of Prebendary Berkeley, and received the coveted Apostolic gift of episcopacy from the persecuted and proscribed Scotch Church; at the hands of Bishops Kilgour, Petrie, and Skinner in the upper room of a house in Long Acre.

Aberdeen ; Nov. 14, 1784. Thus Seabury became the first bishop of the American Church, and his unpretentious episcopal residence at New London, Connecticut, still stands as a relic of transatlantic history. Meanwhile the clergy in the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania had agreed to hold a General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States, to which clergy and laity should send delegates. It met at Philadelphia, Sept. 27, 1785, and drew up an application to the English bishops for consecration of its nominees. But the Convention had proposed some radical changes in the Prayer-book, which the English bishops objected to; so the latter guardedly replied (Feb. 24, 1786) that, while willing to be instrumental in procuring for Americans "the complete exercise of an holy religion, and the enjoyment of that ecclesiastical constitution which we believe to be Apostolical; we cannot but be extremely cautious lest we should be the instruments of establishing an ecclesiastical system which will be called a branch of the Church of England, but may afterwards appear to have departed from it essentially, either in doctrine or in discipline."



SEABURY'S HOUSE, NEW LONDON, CONN., U.S.A.

The Convention met again in June, 1786, to consider this warning, and agreed to abandon the more radical changes. They then elected *Dr. White* of Philadelphia, and *Dr. Provoost* of New York, who were sent to England for consecration. A special Act of Parliament was obtained, empowering the primate to dispense with the oath of allegiance in the case of bishops consecrated for places outside the dominion of the English Crown; and the bishops-elect were consecrated by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, assisted by the bishops of Bath and Wells, and Peterborough, in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, Feb. 4, 1787. The new bishops at once returned to America and landed on the following Easter Day. There were thus two lines of Episcopal succession bestowed upon America, Scotch and English. On Sept. 19, 1790, the archbishop of

Canterbury, assisted by the bishops of London and Rochester, consecrated a fourth American bishop, *James Madison* of Virginia; and on Sept. 17, 1792, all four American bishops united in consecrating *Thomas John Claggett* to be bishop of Maryland. Every American bishop of the present day can trace his episcopal succession, through Bishop Claggett, to the Scotch and English Churches. Having thus obtained its Episcopate, and consequently the power of progression and reproduction, the American branch of the Anglican Church made rapid strides. At the present time (1889) it has no less than 69 bishops, no longer of 'States,' but of dioceses; not on the Atlantic seaboard merely, but throughout the vast American Confederacy. Besides which, it has more than 4,000 clergy, nearly half a million registered communicants, and over a million and a quarter of baptised members. The number of persons baptised in the three years ending 1888 was 171,700, and of confirmees 112,783. Its voluntary contributions for Church purposes in the same three years exceeded 33 millions of dollars, part of which was expended in missions to the heathen.

2. The Colonial Episcopate.—On August 12, 1787, *Dr. Charles Inglis* was consecrated to be the first Colonial bishop. His sphere of work was in Nova Scotia, whither so many of the loyal refugees had fled during the War of Independence; but his jurisdiction included all the British possessions in America until the consecration of *Dr. Mountain* as bishop of Quebec, in 1793, relieved him of the charge of Upper and Lower Canada. In 1839 Newfoundland was made a separate diocese, to still further relieve the bishop of Nova Scotia, and in the same year the diocese of Toronto was founded out of the diocese of Quebec. In 1849 the vast territory belonging to the Hudson's Bay Company was made the diocese of Rupertsland, with *Dr. Anderson* for its first bishop. Canada is now divided into 22 bishoprics.

Turning to our Indian dependencies we do not find the same rapidity of progress, but then it must be remembered that the conditions are different. In 1814 the see of Calcutta was founded, with *Dr. Middleton* for its first bishop, but he was only a sort of chaplain general under the archbishop of Canterbury to look after the chaplains of the East India Company. When Bishop Heber was sent out in 1823, the diocese of Calcutta was declared to include all the possessions of the East India Company, including the Straits Settlements, but in 1835 the bishopric of Madras was created, followed by that of Bombay in 1837. There are now 12 bishops working in Asia, and the bishop of Calcutta is their metropolitan; but with the exception of the Native States of Travancore and Cochin, where the bishop is free from civil restrictions, the law will not allow the Indian bishops "to have or use any jurisdiction, or exercise any episcopal functions, except such as shall or may from time to time be limited by letters patent under the great seal of the United Kingdom;" so that

Church extension and missionary enterprise are much hampered. Nevertheless there are now more than 700 clergy in the East Indies, of whom nearly 300 are natives.

Still better results are recorded of *Australasia*. Until 1836 its vast continents and innumerable islands were held to be an arch-deaconry of Calcutta, several thousand miles away, and there were very few clergy or churches. But since *Dr. Broughton* was made bishop of Australia in 1836, with his seat in Sydney, 14 additional dioceses have been founded; in which over 700 clergy are working; while cathedrals and churches are springing up all over the continent. The first bishop for Tasmania was consecrated in 1842. The Australian Church is governed by its own diocesan and provincial synods, in which the laity take part. In New Zealand, and the Pacific Isles, which received its first missionary (*Mr. Marsden*) in 1814, and its first bishop (*Dr. Selwyn*) in 1841, the same progress appears; for there are now no less than eight dioceses.

In the *West Indies* Church work went on side by side with the civil settlements from the very first, and was largely subsidised by the authorities; but there were no bishops sent there until 1824, when Bishop Coleridge was sent to Barbadoes, and Bishop Lipscombe to Jamaica. In 1868 the Government withdrew its pecuniary aid, and left the West Indian Church to take care of itself. It now comprises ten bishoprics, and includes British Guiana and the Falkland Islands. *South Africa*, too, has an important and growing Church with seven bishoprics; and there are other dioceses at St. Helena, Mauritius, and Sierra Leone, peculiar in their isolation and climatic conditions, which are generally grouped with South Africa. There are also ten missionary bishops who work in North and Mid China, Japan, Honolulu, Madagascar, Equatorial Africa, Niger Territory and Yoruba. All this is the development of a single century; for whereas, before 1787, there were no colonial or missionary bishops, there are now eighty-seven in active work abroad; who in common with the American, Irish, and Scotch bishops look upon the archbishop of Canterbury as their Chief Superintendent. Of course bishops do not make a Church, any more than officers make an army, but they are essential to its government. When bishops go out to the colonies they are invariably followed by more clergy; who bring the means of grace within the reach of the colonists, form them into congregations, and 'build them up in their most holy faith.' The slightest contemplation of the continued prosperity and extension of the Anglican Episcopate, radiating as it does from England to the remotest corners of the world, will help anyone to answer those who say that our Church is worn out or effete. When a tree begins to decay the signs thereof are seen in its withering branches; but the aspect of the National Church shows that from every limb she is continually putting forth new shoots, the leaves whereof are 'for the healing of the nations.'

3. Home Diocesan Changes.—Not only in the colonies has the Episcopate increased. It has been augmented in England also, although not to the same extent. The Home dioceses are not to be measured by area so much as by the number of inhabitants, clergy, and parishes; and the percentage of English bishops was never so disproportionate as now. At the beginning of the 18th century there were not so many people in the whole of England and Wales as there are now in the London postal district, but there were then 27 bishops. Now that the population has increased four-fold there are only 34. But the population and revenues of the 27 old dioceses varied so greatly that the commissioners appointed in 1831, to enquire into the revenues and patronage of the Church, proposed that, for greater efficiency of administration, episcopal incomes should be equalised and the area of the dioceses rearranged; but they did not propose to increase the number of bishops. The rapid growth of northern and midland towns made the creation of new bishoprics imperative, but, the desideratum was to be brought about by amalgamating others. Bishop Gray had made the diocese of Bristol very unpopular by voting against the Reform Bill of 1831, and the rioters burned down the episcopal mansion; perhaps this was one reason why the commissioners obtained the suppression of the see. It had existed from the reign of Henry VIII., but in 1836 its territory was divided among the dioceses of Gloucester, Salisbury, and Bath and Wells; the title and cathedral falling to the see of Gloucester. Active steps are now being taken to revive the Bristol diocese, which ought never to have been done away; an act for the purpose having been recently obtained. Simultaneously with the partition of Bristol, and aided by its revenues, a new diocese was created for South Yorkshire; with the bishop's seat at *Ripon* (see Vol. I., page 92), where there was an historic church. It had been monastic from the days of Wilfrid of York to 1536, when it was made collegiate. Archbishop Theodore had wished it to be an episcopal centre so early as the 7th century; and as parts of Wilfrid's church are incorporated in the present cathedral it may be to us as an embodiment of English Church history, linking us with the days of the Heptarchy; so that no more fitting choice could have been made for the seat of the first modern bishopric.



BRISTOL CATHEDRAL.

4. **The Diocese of Manchester.**—The principles that guided the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to split up the diocese of Bristol led them to sub-divide other dioceses. The see of Ely received from that of Lincoln the counties of Bedford and Huntingdon; Oxford diocese received Berkshire from that of Salisbury, and Buckinghamshire from the see of Lincoln; Peterborough diocese received Leicestershire also from that of Lincoln; and the latter diocese, having got rid of three counties, was enabled to relieve the see of York by taking charge of Nottinghamshire. The Commissioners also proposed to amalgamate the ancient see of Sodor and Man with the diocese of Chester, and unite the old Welsh dioceses of Bangor and St. Asaph; so as to obtain funds wherewith to found a new diocese for the cotton manufacturing towns, with the



MANCHESTER CATHEDRAL.

bishop's seat at *Manchester*. The amalgamations were to come into force on the deaths of one or other of the bishops whose sees were to be affected; but when Bishop Carey of St. Asaph died, the bishop of Bangor declined to be responsible for the extra work; and the Welsh people had by that time petitioned against the suppression of such historic sees. As the relief of the immense diocese of Chester could no longer be delayed, the funds for the diocese of Manchester were raised by private subscription; and Dr. Prince Lee was made the first bishop in 1848. The Cathedral of Manchester was never monastic. It had been a parish church from pre-Norman times, and remained so up to 1422; when Thomas De-la-Warre, the lord of the Manor and also the rector, obtained a charter from Henry V.

by which it became a collegiate body. The extensive glebe lands which this church had held since Saxon times, became more and more valuable as the old parish of Manchester grew from a village into a populous town; but as its revenues belonged to the parish, the daughter churches claimed and obtained, by special Act of Parliament, the right to a proportionate share therein.

5. The Diocese of Truro.—Nearly 30 years elapsed before any further increase was effected in the Home Episcopate. Any projects which were mooted fell through, chiefly because there were political reasons against increasing the number of spiritual peers. At length it was arranged that the number of bishops' seats in the House of Lords should not be increased, but that, with the exception of the archbishops and the bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester, the bishops consecrated in future should occupy the seats in



TRURO CATHEDRAL (*as contemplated*).

order of their consecration. Another difficulty was the question of funds; for it was felt that a bishop's income should be sufficient to enable him to uphold the dignity, hospitality, and charity belonging to his position and office. In the far south-west of England, an enormous extent of territory had for over 800 years been under the oversight of the bishop of Exeter (see Vol. I., p. 40). It was in every way desirable that the ancient diocese of Cornwall should be revived. By 1875, and chiefly through the munificence of one lady sufficient funds were raised to endow the bishopric. It was then easy to obtain a special Act of Parliament (38 and 39 Vict., c. 34) to allot the boundaries of the diocese. The old parish church of St. Mary at Truro was assigned for the bishop's seat, but as this was altogether unsuitable for the cathedral a new one had to be built; and it is a most encouraging sign of the times that, even while the Church's enemies are besieging her gates, her children are nobly coming forward with hundreds of thousands of pounds to build and endow new cathedrals, which shall not fear to hold up their heads beside the marvels of mediæval architecture. Truro diocese lays claim to great antiquity. We read of a Christian king of Cornwall in the 4th

order of their consecration. Another difficulty was the question of funds; for it was felt that a bishop's income should be sufficient to enable him to uphold the dignity, hospitality, and charity belonging to his position and office. In the far south-west of England, an enormous extent of territory had for over 800 years been under

century, and there are remains of a 5th century church (see Vol. I., p. 39) still standing within ten miles of Truro. The foundation stones of the new cathedral were laid in 1877 with grand masonic honours by the Prince of Wales, Duke of Cornwall; who was present at its consecration also, November 3, 1887. Only the chancel and transepts are built as yet; the nave and towers will come in time. Cathedrals cannot be built in a decade. The ancient parish church of St. Mary, Truro, is incorporated in the south aisle of the chancel. When completed the cathedral will accommodate 2,500 worshippers. On the happy day when the eastern portion was dedicated, Archbishop Benson (to whom, when first bishop of Truro, the commencement and progress of the building was due) preached a memorable sermon. 'The anti-religious politician would exclude history from education,' he said. 'The ultramontane would exclude it from being cross-examined. Yet happily both are making history meanwhile, and writing themselves down in it. Well may they hate it here in England. The one can but read that England was a Church before it was a State: the other that England never acquiesced in the foreign prelate. . . . Rise to your birthrights—your English, catholic, apostolic, Christian birthrights—help, comfort, strengthen, revive, found.'

6. The Diocese of St. Albans.—The enormously rapid growth of London loudly called for some re-arrangement of the metropolitan dioceses. The pressure was greatest on the bishop of Rochester, who used to be responsible for Essex and Hertfordshire, besides part of Kent; and the bishop of Winchester, whose jurisdiction formerly included the county of Surrey. So it was arranged that Essex and Herts should be made a separate diocese; and that Rochester should be bounded by the southern bank of the Thames, to relieve the see of Winchester of the care of Surrey. Part of the endowment for the new diocese was obtained by the sale of the bishop of Winchester's London palace and part by voluntary subscriptions, a suitable church for its cathedral being ready to hand in the famous *St. Albans Abbey*, which yields to no cathedral in antiquity or historic glory¹. Its name and traditions unmistakably remind us that the ancient British Church had adherents ready to shed their blood in her defence. The church was partly built in the Saxon times, partly about the time of the Norman Conquest, and has been added to several times since. It was restored by public subscription in 1688, and has lately been completely renovated by the private munificence of an earnest layman. Dr. Thomas Claughton, who had been bishop of Rochester before, became the first bishop; A.D. 1877.

7. The Diocese of Liverpool.—Thirty years' experience of the working of the diocese of Manchester had conclusively demon-

¹ Two views of St. Albans Cathedral will be found in Vol. I., pages 11 and 153.

strated the wisdom of its foundation. As the diocese of Chester was still far too large and populous for any ordinary mortal to superintend properly, and as there were several other districts of England in similar straits, a number of prominent churchmen met in London in 1876 to consider what was best to be done. They petitioned the Government to support any well-considered measure that might be introduced in Parliament for the extension of the Home Episcopate, and the redistribution and division of dioceses. The result was that



LIVERPOOL
CATHEDRAL.


in 1878 an Act was passed (41 and 42 Viet., c. 68) which provided for the foundation of bishoprics at Liverpool, Newcastle, Southwell, and Wakefield; as soon as sufficient funds were placed in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to enable the bishops to receive adequate stipends. Liverpool was the first to take shape, because the merchant princes of that city could better spare the needful funds; and the diocese became an accomplished fact in 1880. We may take some statistics of the diocese of Liverpool as illustrative of the need for an increased episcopate. In the year 1687 there were only 25 churches in the whole territory now forming the see. The popula-

tion increased, and the churches also, so that by the year 1837 there were no less than 78 churches in the same area. 53 new churches had sprung up in 150 years. But during the next 50 years no less than 122 quite new churches were added to the number, making 200 altogether. These figures were given by Dr. Ryle, the first bishop of the see, when he consecrated a new church on the last day of the year 1887; and when we remember that the bishops are

the generals, so to speak, of the Church, it becomes manifest that one additional staff-officer at least is needed in a district where the rank and file of the clergy have been multiplied tenfold. As at Truro, there was no suitable Church in Liverpool for a cathedral; and the mother church of the city, 'Old St. Peter's,' built in 1704, accommodates the bishop's stool. But unlike Truro, the Churchmen of Liverpool have not yet seen their way to build a new cathedral; although there are many men in the second city of our great empire who could build, from foundation to vane, without missing the money, a cathedral which should worthily represent the dignity of our National Church to the streams of Americans and Colonists who pass through England's chief seaport on their European travels. On the other hand, it is but fair to remember that the city is still insufficiently provided with parish churches, through the inability of Churchmen to keep pace with the very rapid increase of the population in recent times.

8. The Diocese of Newcastle.—In 1882 the county of Northumberland obtained a cathedral of its own once more. The development of the mining and manufacturing populations that have sprung up in the neighbourhood of the Tyne, demanded that some special steps should be taken to provide for the spiritual direction of that distant county. It is felt by many that the arrangement of England into counties offers the best solution for a further extension of the episcopate—*i.e.* that there should be a bishop provided for each county, exclusive of urban bishops for large centres of population such as London, Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham; which need resident Bishops all their own. The position of a bishop is far different now, than when in the earliest days of English Christianity he was the head of a devoted band of missionaries. From the nature of things their position has developed into that of governors of the extensive and multitudinous organizations, called parishes, many of which are themselves more populous than some kingdoms were under the Heptarchy. Newcastle was chosen to be the seat of the northernmost bishopric because it is a great metropolis, the centre of trade and commerce for the north. But Lindisfarne was the centre of Church life and missionary enterprise long before the Church of England was fully formed. It was indeed 'the cradle of Anglian Christianity.' For 240 years from its foundation by St. Aidan, Lindisfarne was an Episcopal seat. Chester-le-Street held the honour for 113 years after the Danish invasion; and then the bishop's stool was taken to Durham, where it remained till now. The revenues of Lindisfarne were appropriated to Durham by the Norman nobles; and then Lindisfarne became a dependent cell to its own offspring. The miniature cathedral of the island was destroyed when the monasteries were suppressed, and is now in ruins. Many people hoped that

when the bishopric of Northumbria was refounded the old title of Lindisfarne would be revived, and that the fine old abbey church of Hexham (see Vol. I., p. 90), which had also been the seat of a pre-Norman bishopric, would receive the new bishops' stool; but in this business-like age sentiment must necessarily give way to usefulness. The old parish Church of S. Nicholas, Newcastle, which was founded at the Norman Conquest, rebuilt in the 14th century, and enlarged in the 15th century, is not unworthy of episcopal rank; although it was never intended to be more than the parish church of a busy town. It was made a collegiate church by Henry VIII. The funds for the endowment of this see were soon obtained, and a respected member of the Society of Friends gave Benwell Tower to be the residence of the bishop. So noble a gift, from one who did not conform to the Church of England, serves to indicate that there is much latent respect for the Apostolic form of Church government among those who have it not. The spire of Newcastle Cathedral, though an architectural deception upheld by iron supports, is unsurpassed for elegance and proportion. The inside of the cathedral has been renovated recently at great cost, and the chancel adorned with tasteful gifts from loving friends. The first bishop, Dr. Ernest Wilberforce, was consecrated on St. James's Day, 1882, in Durham Cathedral.



NEWCASTLE CATHEDRAL.

9. The Diocese of Southwell. — The ancient diocese of Lichfield has been the mother of no less than twelve daughter sees ; all of them flourishing and all densely populated. Derbyshire was taken out of it in 1884, and Nottinghamshire was taken away from the diocese of Lincoln at the same time. From these two counties another new diocese was formed. Many wished Nottingham to be the seat of the bishop, but the grand old minster of Southwell (see page 57) obtained the preference, although it is somewhat inconvenient to reach. The first bishop (Dr. Ridding) was consecrated on the feast of SS. Philip and James, 1884. The funds of this diocese were very difficult to raise, but the fact that the pence of the poor and the gold of the rich were mingled to produce the desired end will help to account for the satisfaction felt by Churchmen in that neighbourhood at the completion of so great an enterprise. The history of Southwell Minster dates from 'Old English,' *i.e.*, Pre-Norman times. It was founded to be a home for secular canons by Edgar the Pacific, and placed under the rule of the archbishops of York, A.D. 958. The nave and transepts were built about 1110, and the rest of the fabric in the 13th century. From the 12th to the 16th century it was accounted "the head mother church of the town and county of Nottingham," and for 300 years after it was the most important of the collegiate churches refounded by Henry VIII.

Nothing is more clear in modern church history than the fact that the majority of English people are devotedly attached to the Episcopal method of Church government ; and that Churchmen value and, for the most part, reverence their bishops. They would value them more if they saw them oftener, but to that end we must continue to sub-divide the dioceses. At present it is quite impossible for the majority of bishops to visit all the parishes in their dioceses under two or three years, and many parishes hardly ever see their chief pastor at all. Only those who travel much can form any idea of the magnitude of England's parochial system, *e.g.* — In the diocese of Norwich there are over 800 resident incumbents, some of whom have two or three churches to look after. Were its bishop to spend a day in each parish, to encourage the pastor, confirm the young, and cheer the old parishioners, he might, by working incessantly six days a week, perform the round of the diocese in three years ! Were he to preach twice every Sunday, at a morning service in one parish and at some other parish in the evening, when the majority of the people could get to church to listen to his words, it would not be possible for him to complete the tour in less than nine years ! There used to be, and should be now, a bishop for Norfolk and another for Suffolk ; but the comparative poverty of the district prevents the sub-division. Surely this is a matter that concerns the whole Church. At present thousands of people in East Anglia have never seen or heard their bishop, and cannot therefore understand the usefulness of episcopal supervision, although their chief pastor is rarely out of his diocese.

10. **The Diocese of Wakefield.**—The most recent diocese of the Victorian era, completing the intention of the Act of 1878, is that of Wakefield. Its formation was delayed because, owing to the agricultural depression of the last few years, many intending donors to its endowment fund were unable to fulfil their promises of subscription. Wakefield has been world-renowned since Oliver Goldsmith used its name as a fictitious title for his famous romance ; although any other secluded country village, as Wakefield was in the middle of the 18th century, would have served his purpose just as well. It is now a thriving business place, and the centre of a number of large manufacturing towns. The creation of the diocese of which it has been made the episcopal seat will therefore greatly



WAKEFIELD CATHEDRAL.

relieve the bishopric of Ripon, from which it was taken. Dr. Walsham How, who had previously won golden opinions as a Suffragan bishop working in East London, was appointed to be the first Bishop, A.D. 1888. More than £10,000 were raised by the zeal and enterprise of many Yorkshire ladies, to build a suitable house for the

bishop ; and the general endowment fund was subscribed by a much larger number of persons than any modern diocese. The 'Official Year Book' for 1890 gives the following figures as the amount raised for endowing the several dioceses by voluntary subscriptions. Truro, £70,948 ; St. Albans, £55,073 ; Liverpool, £94,676 ; Newcastle, £88,866 ; Southwell, £65,835 ; and Wakefield, including house, £93,649—Total, £469,048.

Proposals have lately been made to found a new bishopric for Warwickshire, to relieve the diocese of Worcester, with the seat at Birmingham ; another for Surrey, to relieve the see of Rochester, of which the old priory church of Southwark should be the cathedral ; a third for Suffolk, reviving its ancient bishopric ; and two others for Leicestershire and Essex. But the diocese most needing division is that of London. 350 years ago the necessity was apparent to Cardinal Wolsey, and Westminster Abbey was made a cathedral for the western part, St. Paul's cathedral being confined to the city and

the Eastern suburbs. But after the removal of Bishop Thirlby to Norwich, in 1550, the Westminster bishopric lapsed; although its capitular body still remains. Since that time the population of London has quadrupled itself twice over, and under the care of its bishop there are now more than 3,000,000 souls! One would think that zeal and energy, coupled with a little willingness on the part of the Bishop of London and the Dean of Westminster to sacrifice some of the traditions of their respective positions, might make the authorities in Church and Realm realise the necessity of reviving the see of Westminster, so as to give East London a territorial bishop of its own; and, by consequence, infuse new life into many parishes.

11. Suffragan-Bishops.—It is natural to expect that the Church will be more efficiently administered when there are more bishops to control and guide affairs. With a well-disciplined hierarchy there must come a better parochial administration, and the spiritual life of England cannot fail to be increased. On the other hand, we have recently been warned "to keep our Christian groupings wide enough and our centres strong enough. When every petty City of Africa had its bishop (4th century) the effectiveness of the Episcopate was lowest. Vigour and character were not in hand for so many posts of leaders. Poly-episcopacy ceased to be episcopacy when the diocese became so small a unit. The like multiplication in Italy converted churches into cliques, and delivered Italy over to the one strong sec, and Europe followed the leading country. Half a century with us has seen seven colonial sees grow to seventy, and so vast still is their area that another half century will not be too long to work out the sub-division. Yet the old policy of England must be nowhere forgotten, that sub-division should cease before dioceses become too small for the influence of each to radiate through all; before the administration anywhere becomes so narrow as to represent only local patriotism." This is why quite recently, as in the reign of King Henry VIII., *Suffragan-Bishops* have been appointed to assist in certain Home Dioceses, and Coadjutor-Bishops to help in some colonial sees. Strictly speaking all bishops under a metropolitan are 'suffragans,' but the term is becoming limited to assistant-bishops who have no independent action, and who stand in the same relation to Diocesans as assistant clergy do to incumbents of parishes. The first suffragan of modern times was Dr. Mackenzie, consecrated in 1870 to assist in the diocese of Lincoln, with the title of *Bishop of Nottingham*. The Greek archbishop of Syra and Tenos happened to be staying in England at the time, and took part in the consecration; an act of communion between the East and West that might with advantage be repeated. The legal powers under which this appointment was carried out were obtained by the revival of an obsolete but

1 From the Primate's opening sermon to the Lambeth Conference of 1888.

unrepealed Statute (26 Henry VIII., c. 14), which sanctioned suffragans for certain sees, with specific titles, according to the names of towns mentioned in the act. Other overworked bishops took advantage of the statute, but their suffragans were sometimes compelled to take very inappropriate names; as when the Suffragan appointed to help the bishop of London in 1879 received the title Bishop of Bedford, with which town or county he had nothing whatever to do; but an act has lately (1888) been introduced by the Lord Chancellor (Halsbury) by which in future the Crown in Council may substitute the names of more appropriate places to designate the sphere of a suffragan's work. But the multiplication of 'curate bishops,' though it may relieve overtaxed diocesans, does not altogether meet the requirements of overgrown dioceses. They are an irresponsible body, without coercive jurisdiction, who cannot of themselves initiate permanent reforms; and their work may at any moment be interfered with or terminated. There are now eight suffragans assisting in English dioceses. There are also many retired colonial bishops who have resigned their sees for various reasons, six of whom are working as assistant-bishops in certain English dioceses. Thus there are 48 bishops to whom the clergy and laity of England may look for such grace and guidance as flow from 'the historic Episcopate.' At the present time (1890) the total number of bishops of the Anglican Communion—in the United Kingdom, in our Colonial dependencies and missionary stations, and in the United States—is two hundred and thirty-five.

12. **The Lambeth Conferences.**¹—A means has quite recently been found of binding together the various offshoots of the British Church in closer bonds of mutual affection and responsibility. In 1865 the Canadian Church, feeling no doubt its isolation and the need of friendly intercourse with the Mother-Church of England, sent a synodical request to the Convocation of Canterbury; urging the then Primate (Dr. Longley) to adopt such means as would enable all members of the Anglican Communion "to have a share in the deliberations for her welfare, and be permitted to have a representation in one General Council of her members gathered from every land." The result was that, after careful deliberation in Convocation, letters were sent to the Home, Colonial, and Missionary Bishops, and to the Bishops of the 'Protestant Episcopal Church of America'—144 bishops all together; inviting them to meet at Lambeth Palace in Sept., 1867. Seventy-six bishops accepted the invitation, and their meeting is known as the *First Lambeth Conference*. The assembled prelates expressed deep sorrow at 'the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world;' and recorded their solemn conviction that unity would be most effectually

¹ See 'Origin and History of the Lambeth Conferences,' S.P.C.K., 5s.; and the Encyclical Letter from the bishops assembled in 1888, 6d.

promoted 'by maintaining the faith in its purity and integrity, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils; and by drawing each of us to our common Lord, by giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, by the cultivation of a spirit of charity, and a love of the Lord's appearing.' The Conference was not intended to partake of the nature of a Synod, competent to enact decrees by which the Church should be bound; but merely to discuss matters of current importance, and pass resolutions which might guide the future action of those in authority. As such a conference had never been held before there were no precedents as to procedure; consequently all that they did was experimental, and far from unanimous with respect to the resolutions; but the prelates were all of one mind as to the necessity of issuing a formal address to all faithful members, clerical and lay, of the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic; by which all were warned against papal corruptions of the true faith revealed by the Scriptures, exhorted to beware of causing divisions contrary to primitive Church doctrine, and to pray and seek for unity.

In December, 1872, the Canadian Church again asked the Canterbury Convocation to unite with it in requesting the Primate (Dr. Tait) to summon a second meeting. This was followed in 1873 by similar requests from the West Indian bishops, and in 1874 by the American bishops. But Archbishop Tait did not see his way to issue invitations until he had further opportunities of corresponding with the Anglican bishops throughout the world as to the expediency of a Conference, and the subjects to be discussed. 173 invitations were sent out in 1877, and 108 bishops accepted; eight of whom, however, were unable to be present. On June 29, 1878, the Primate welcomed the prelates from St. Augustine's marble chair in Canterbury Cathedral, which had been placed on the altar-steps; but the sessions were held in the great library of Lambeth Palace. In this *Second Lambeth Conference* the same rule was enforced as at the first: that the discussions should not encroach upon doctrinal matters or questions of discipline, with the view of issuing authoritative decrees; lest it should seem that the Conference claimed a power to interfere with the autonomy of the Colonial and American Churches. Brotherly intercourse, with mutual help and comfort, were the chief objects; and the discussions were limited to such subjects as bore upon unity and inter-communion. As before, the conclusions arrived at, after many days of serious deliberation, were published in a letter addressed to the Faithful; in which the reports of the committees appointed to consider the different subjects were embodied. The Conference of 1878 concluded with a grand service in St. Paul's Cathedral, when the Bishop of Pennsylvania preached the sermon; in which he said:—"Never before have all branches of the Anglican Communion been so fully represented in

an ecclesiastical assembly. Such a gathering converges to itself the eyes of the thinking world, and such a gathering must radiate from itself a power for weal or woe that shall reach to the distant ages. We met as standard-bearers of the Cross of Christ; and we separate to go back to our dioceses more impressed than ever, that it is in and through an uplifted Christ—faithfully held up and fully displayed—that our work can be accomplished; and that all men—men of all races, all climes, all countries—can be brought to the feet of the Crucified, and to the Church which is His body.”



LAMBETH PALACE.

So beneficial to the welfare of the Church did these Conferences prove that they are likely to recur every ten years. A still more numerous attended one was held at the same place in 1888 under the present Primate (Dr. Benson), which will be known in history as the *Third Lambeth Conference*. 209 letters of invitation were sent out, and 145 bishops responded by their presence; who came literally ‘from the ends of the earth.’ The methods of procedure followed the precedents established in 1867 and 1878, but were of a much more important character. The published Eneyclieal, or Letter to the Faithful, shews that these Conferences are likely to become a means of directing the practical work of the Church from time to time. The conclusions arrived at by the Conference from the resolutions of its special committees, relate to morality, social problems,

1 The retired Colonial bishops, having no official oversight of churches or permanent episcopal work, were not invited to the Conference.

administration, mutual relations, and the unity of Christendom. In grave and dignified terms the prelates have rebuked the flagrant sins of intemperance and impurity which defile all nations; upheld the sanctity and inviolability of marriage; and asserted the sacred character of the Lord's Day, now so often disregarded. So important are these official utterances that every Churchman should purchase and study with care the pamphlet in which they are set forth. We have only room here for the statements relating to the question of *Home Reunion*. The special committee laid down four articles as the bases on which approaches might be made, towards the desired end.

"(A) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as 'containing all things necessary to salvation,' and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

"(B) The Apostles' Creed, as the baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

"(C) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution and of the elements ordained by Him.

"(D) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church."

After anxious discussion upon these articles the general body of Bishops arrived at the following conclusions:—

"The attitude of the Anglican communion towards the religious bodies now separated from it by unhappy divisions would appear to be this:—We hold ourselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with any of those who may desire intercommunion with us in a more or less perfect form. We lay down conditions on which such intercommunion is, in our opinion, and according to our conviction, possible. For, however we may long to embrace those now alienated from us, so that the ideal of the one flock under the one Shepherd may be realised, we must not be unfaithful stewards of the great deposit intrusted to us. We cannot desert our position either as to faith or discipline. That concord would, in our judgment, be neither true nor desirable which should be produced by such surrender.

"But we gladly and thankfully recognise the real religious work which is carried on by Christian bodies not of our communion. We cannot close our eyes to the visible blessing which has been vouchsafed to their labours for Christ's sake. Let us not be misunderstood on this point. We are not insensible to the strong ties, the rooted convictions, which attach them to their present position. These we respect, as we wish that on our side our own principles and feelings may be respected. Competent observers, indeed, assert that not in England only, but in all parts of the Christian world, there is a real yearning for unity—that men's hearts are moved more than heretofore towards Christian fellowship. The conference has shown in its discussions as well as its resolutions that it is deeply penetrated with this feeling. May the Spirit of Love move on the troubled waters of religious differences."

13. Conclusion.—With such noble words we might well bring this little book to a period ; but there is one important consideration which the writer desires should be his final word. Because we rejoice at the extension of our Church's work abroad, so that the sun never sets upon her daughter churches, it is all the more necessary that we should make up our minds not to allow the parent stem to be injured. It is of the national religion in England and Wales that we have been thinking mainly ; a religion which we have inherited from the earliest times, which has been bound up with the national character, has sympathized with all its joys and sorrows, and has also reaped in return for its spiritual sowing and nurture a measure of temporal prosperity. We know full well that those who envy her goodly heritage are many and resolute ; but that knowledge should make us all the more determined to hold fast that which has been committed to our care and keeping. We must do this, not for our own sake only, but for the sake of the encouragement which we owe to our brethren beyond the seas, and to the missionaries who are bravely reducing heathen lands to the obedience of Christ our King ; and for the sake of future generations, for whom we are trustees. Twelve hundred years ago, when many petty princes were struggling for the territory now called England and Wales, the early missionaries laboured to unite the tribes from which we sprang in bonds of peace and love through the "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism ; one God and Father of us all." After they had succeeded, the united religious society so founded became an united state and kingdom ; since which time the religious and civil organizations have been identical, while patriotic and spiritual aspirations have gone hand-in-hand. The union was not of man's making or seeking, nor was it of sudden growth. It came about by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and it has been maintained by Divine favour for the supply of mutual necessities. From the union there have sprung many generations of Englishmen who have become good citizens because they were early trained in the fear and nurture of the Lord ; and through their lives and work at home and abroad the world has learned to respect 'Christian England.' If there were any fault or offence, any evidence of unfaithfulness, the Realm would be within its right in claiming a divorce ; but so long as the Church is true, even though her consort may not be true to her, it must be said, as we say of domestic unions :—'Those whom God has joined together, let not man put asunder ;' while the watch-word of all true sons and daughters of the union must be

'QUIS SEPARABIT?'



CHRONOLOGY

OF

CHIEF EVENTS REFERRED TO IN THE SECOND VOLUME.

| A.D. | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 1377-1399. Richard II. | |
| 1338-1453. Wars with France—"Hundred Years' War" | 2 |
| 1390. Statutes of <i>Provisors</i> re-enacted. | 8 |
| 1393. The Statute of <i>Præmunire</i> re-enacted | 8 |
| 1395. Lollards plead for Church Reform | 6 |
| 1399-1413. Henry IV. | |
| 1401. Statute " <i>De Heretico Comburendo</i> "—William Sawtry burnt | 6 |
| 1404 & 1410. Commons propose to confiscate Church property | 7 |
| 1413-1422. Henry V. | |
| 1414. Alien Priors suppressed by King | 15 |
| 1414-18 Council of Constance. Huss and Jerome burnt | 10 |
| 1417-18 Pope Martin V. "provides" thirteen bishops for England | 9 |
| 1422-1461. Henry VI. | |
| 1426. Papal Bulls to suspend Chichele seized by Government | 9 |
| 1428. Wycliffe's bones exhumed and burnt | 12 |
| 1437. All Souls' College, Oxford, founded by Chichele | 16 |
| 1440. King's and Queen's Colleges at Cambridge founded | 16 |
| 1449. Commons attempt to tax the clergy | 8 |
| 1455-1485. Wars of the Roses | 18 |
| 1457. Condemnation of Bishop Pecock. | 12 |
| 1461-1483. Edward IV. | |
| 1473. Caxton begins to print at Westminster | 17 |
| 1483-1485. Richard III. (Edward V. reigned two months) | |
| 1485. Battle of Bosworth Field | 19 |
| 1485-1509. Henry VII. | |
| 1498. Martyrdom of Savonarola | 20 |
| 1503. Wareham Archbishop of Canterbury | 21 |
| 1509-1547. Henry VIII. | |
| 1512. Dean Colet advocates Church reform | 23 |
| 1515. Wolsey becomes Lord Chancellor | 24 |
| 1516. Erasmus publishes Greek Testament | 24 |
| " Revised Breviary published | 39 |
| 1517. Wolsey permitted to be Papal Legate. | 24 |
| 1520. Martin Luther burns Papal Bull at Wittenberg | 35 |
| 1521. King Henry's book against Luther | 35 |

| A.D. | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 1523. Wolsey, as Legate, suppresses many monasteries | 25 |
| 1526. Tyndale's New Testament published | 37 |
| 1527. Negotiations commenced for Henry's divorce | 27 |
| 1529. Queen Catharine appeals to Rome | 28 |
| „ Sir T. More succeeds Wolsey as Chancellor | 26 |
| 1530. Cranmer pleads the King's cause at Rome | 29 |
| 1531. Convocation, threatened with <i>Præmunire</i> , proposes limita- tions of Papal authority and accepts Royal Supremacy } | 31 |
| 1532. Appeals to Rome forbidden by Statute (24 Hen. VIII. c. 12) | 28 |
| 1533. Archbishop Cranmer pronounces the King's divorce | 29 |
| 1534. Convocation declares against papal jurisdiction | 30 |
| „ Statute, 25 Hen. VIII., c. 19, embodied the Submission of Clergy Convocation had made in 1531 | 34 |
| „ Payment of first-fruits to Rome forbidden | 30 |
| „ Statute, 25 Hen. VIII., c. 21, forbade issue of Papal Bulls | 30 |
| „ Convocation pleads for translation of Bible | 37 |
| 1535. Thomas Cromwell made Vicar-General | 51 |
| „ Coverdale's Bible published | 38 |
| „ More and Fisher beheaded for denying Royal Supremacy | 33 |
| 1536. Bible set up in Churches | 38 |
| „ The Ten Articles issued by Convocation | 40 |
| „ Dissolution of small Monasteries and Friaries | 46 |
| 1537. " <i>Institution of a Christian Man</i> " published | 40 |
| „ Pope's authority condemned (28 Hen. VIII., c. 10) | 30 |
| „ Matthews' Bible published | 38 |
| 1538. Negotiations with Lutheran Divines | 36 |
| „ Surrender of many Greater Monasteries | 49 |
| 1539. Pope interdicts England and excommunicates Henry | 33 |
| „ New Bishoprics Act. (31 Hen. VIII., c. 9) | 49 |
| „ Remaining Monasteries Dissolved (31 Hen. VIII., c. 13) | 49 |
| „ Cranmer's Great Bible published | 38 |
| „ The Six Articles' Statute accepted by Convocation | 41 |
| 1540. Thomas Cromwell beheaded | 52 |
| 1541. Dioceses of Chester, Gloucester and Peterborough founded | 54 |
| 1542. Convocation ordered lessons to be read in English | 39 |
| „ Convocation appointed Committee to revise Liturgy. | 39 |
| 1543. English Litany published for use in public worship | 39 |
| 1545. (Dec. 13) First Meeting of Council of Trent | 91 |
| 1546. Chantries and University Endowments granted to King | 60 |
| 1547-53. Edward VI. | |
| 1547. Episcopal Jurisdiction licensed by the Crown | 62 |
| „ "Royal Visitation" of the Church | 63 |
| „ Convocation annuls Canons against Clerical Matrimony | 69 |
| 1548. Election of Bishops superseded by "Letters Patent" | 68 |
| „ First English Communion Office | 66 |
| „ Foreign reformers invited by Cranmer | 69 |
| 1549. First Prayer Book of Edward VI.'s reign authorised | 66 |

| A.D. | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 1549. Second Royal Visitation | 67 |
| " Two Anabaptists burnt for blasphemy by Cranmer's advice | 69 |
| 1550. Reformed Ordinal completed | 68 |
| " Altars removed from East end of Churches | 71 |
| " Six Bishops deprived and imprisoned by the Council | 68 |
| 1551. Hooper imprisoned for objecting to Vestments | 69 |
| 1552. Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.'s reign authorised | 71 |
| 1553. Forty-two Articles of Religion published | 90 |
| 1553. Futile attempt to make Lady Jane Grey Queen of England | 72 |
| 1553-58. Mary Tudor. | |
| 1553. Imprisoned Bishops released. Gardiner made Chancellor | 74 |
| " Flight of clergy and refugees | 73 |
| " Edwardian Bishops deposed, imprisoned, and superseded | 72 |
| " Religious laws of Edward repealed | 74 |
| 1554. Wyatt's rebellion and execution of Lady Jane | 74 |
| " Mary marries Philip II. of Spain, (July) | 76 |
| " Cardinal Pole appointed Papal Legate, (November) | 76 |
| " Parliament and Convocation reconciled with Rome | 76 |
| " Anti-Papal Statutes since 1529 repealed | 76 |
| 1555. The Marian Persecutions begin. Four Bishops burnt | 77 |
| 1556. Cranmer burnt for heresy and succeeded by Pole | 79 |
| 1557. Cardinal Pole's Visitation of the Universities | 81 |
| 1558. (Nov. 17). Deaths of Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole | 81 |
| 1558-1603. Elizabeth. | |
| " Return of the Exiles | 82 |
| 1559. Royal Supremacy and English Liturgy revived | 83 |
| " Act of uniformity (1 Eliz., c. 2) enforcing Liturgy | 84 |
| " Deprivation of Marian Bishops (May to November) | 85 |
| " Consecration of Parker and other Bishops (December) | 87 |
| 1560. Elizabeth aids the Scotch Reformers | 103 |
| " Pope offers to sanction Reformation if he may be supreme | 93 |
| 1561. Severe Acts passed against Romanists | 93 |
| 1562. Jewel's <i>Apology</i> published | 91 |
| 1563. Thirty-eight Articles issued by Convocation, many Puritan clergy refuse to subscribe them and leave the Church | 90 |
| " (Nov. 11). Last Meeting of Council of Trent | 92 |
| 1567. Dutch religious refugees settle in eight English towns | 94 |
| 1568. First Dissenting Community (Congregational) founded | 95 |
| " Parker's Bible published | 91 |
| 1569. Insurrection in North on behalf of Queen of Scots | 98 |
| 1570. Pius V. incites English to disloyalty, and excommunicates Elizabeth. Romanists become a distinct sect | 93 |
| 1571. Severe laws passed against Romanists and Papal Bulls | 93 |
| " Members of Parliament propose alterations in Religion | 96 |
| 1572. First Presbyterian Congregation in England (Cartwright's) | 96 |
| " Massacre of St. Bartholomew | 94 |
| 1577. Archbishop Grindal suspended for encouraging Prophecyings | 96 |

| A.D. | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 1580. Jesuits come to "convert" England | 94 |
| 1583. High Commission Court established | 97 |
| 1584. Richard Hooker appointed to Mastership of the Temple | 98 |
| 1586. The Babington Conspiracy | 98 |
| 1587. Execution of Mary Queen of Scots | 98 |
| „ Martin Mar-Prelate libels published | 97 |
| „ Sixtus V. sanctions hostilities against Elizabeth | 99 |
| 1588. (July) Destruction of Spanish Armada | 101 |
| 1592. Presbyterianism established in Scotland | 108 |
| 1593. Penal Statutes against Romanists and Nonconformists | 101 |
| 1595. The Lambeth Articles published | 98 |
| 1600. An East India Company formed | 103 |
| 1603-25. James I. | |
| 1603. Millenary Petition | 110 |
| 1604. Hampton Court Conference | 111 |
| „ Canons Ecclesiastical published | 111 |
| 1605. Gunpowder Treason Plot discovered | 113 |
| 1606. Statutes against Romanists. | 114 |
| 1608. First Permanent Settlement in America | 117 |
| 1610. Scotch Episcopate restored | 114 |
| 1611. <i>The Authorised Version</i> of the Bible published | 115 |
| 1612. Legate and Wightman burnt by Abp. Abbott's advice | 119 |
| 1618. Book of Sunday Sports published | 128 |
| 1623. Titular Bishops sent to England by the Pope | 121 |
| 1625-28. Montague and others censured in Parliament | 123 |
| 1625-49. Charles I. | |
| 1628. The Petition of Right. | 124 |
| „ Parliament resolves itself into a Committee of Religion | 125 |
| 1629. Parliament attacks unauthorised taxes and is dissolved | 125 |
| 1630. Laud and Strafford become the King's chief advisers | 126 |
| „ Dr. Leighton pilloried for writing against Episcopacy. | 128 |
| 1633-6. Archbishop Laud enforces discipline | 127 |
| 1637. Severe proceedings against Puritans in Star Chamber | 128 |
| „ Hampden's Trial for resisting Ship money tax | 126 |
| „ The Scotch resist Laud's Liturgy and Canons | 130 |
| 1638. <i>Solemn League and Covenant</i> signed in Scotland | 131 |
| 1639. Scotch abolish Episcopacy and prepare for War | 131 |
| 1640. Convocation sat as a Synod after Dissolution of Parliament | 132 |
| „ (Nov. 3) First meeting of The Long Parliament | 132 |
| „ Impeachment of Strafford and Laud | 133 |
| „ Parliamentary Committee appointed to deprive the clergy | 135 |
| 1641. High Commission Court abolished | 134 |
| „ The Grand Remonstrance | 134 |
| „ Episcopacy suspended—Root and Branch Bill, 1642-3 | 138 |
| 1642. Civil War begins at Nottingham (August). | 134 |
| 1643. Westminster Assembly convoked to advise Long Parliament | 140 |
| „ The Covenant enforced in return for Scotch alliance | 135 |

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

291

| A.D. | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 1645. (Jan. 10) Execution of Archbishop Laud | 140 |
| „ Directory substituted for proscribed Liturgy | 140 |
| „ Charles I. declines to 'establish' Presbyterianism | 142 |
| „ "New Model" Army organised by Oliver Cromwell | 142 |
| „ Profanation of Cathedrals and Churches by Puritan soldiers | 150 |
| 1646. King surrenders to the Scots, who sell him to Parliament . | 142 |
| „ King refuses to sanction abolition of Episcopacy | 142 |
| 1647. The Army seize the King (June 4) | 142 |
| „ The King escapes to Carisbrook | 143 |
| 1648. Presbyterians take up arms for the King, but are defeated. | 143 |
| „ The King in despair agrees to proposals of Parliament . . | 143 |
| „ Col. Pride expels Presbyterians from Parliament (Dec. 6) . | 143 |
| 1649. Execution of Charles I. (January 30) | 144 |
| 1649-85. Charles II. (In exile until 1660). | |
| 1649. (February) The "Rump" abolishes House of Lords, pro- | |
| hibits Monarchy, and issues Declaration on Religion | 146 |
| „ <i>The Engagement</i> substituted for the Covenant | 147 |
| „ (May 19) The Commonwealth proclaimed | 146 |
| 1650. Quakers come into notice as a sect | 148 |
| 1651. Battle of Worcester and flight of Charles II. | 149 |
| 1653. The "Rump" orders the demolition of Churches | 152 |
| „ Cromwell expels the "Rump" and nominates a Parliament | 153 |
| „ (Dec. 16) Cromwell made Lord Protector | 154 |
| 1654. (March 20) Triers appointed to administer patronage . . | 156 |
| „ (Aug. 20) Commission to inquire into character of clergy . . | 156 |
| „ (Sept. 3) First Protectorate Parliament met | 154 |
| 1655. (Nov. 27) Cromwell's Persecuting Edict issued | 157 |
| 1656. Second Protectorate Parliament. Cromwell refuses the crown | 155 |
| 1658. Inauguration of Cromwell's House of Lords | 156 |
| „ (Sept. 3) Death of Cromwell and accession of his son Richard | 160 |
| 1659. Army restores the "Rump" Parliament | 160 |
| 1660. General Monk declares for a free Parliament (Jan. 3) . . | 161 |
| „ The Declaration from Breda (April 14) | 161 |
| „ (March 16) The Long Parliament issues orders for a "Con- | |
| vention," and agrees to its own dissolution | 161 |
| „ (May 1) Convention invites Charles II. to return | 161 |
| 1660. Restoration of Charles II. and the Church. | |
| „ Many Clergy return to their Benefices. Juxon Primate . . | 162 |
| 1661. The Savoy Conference—Revision of the Liturgy | 163 |
| „ Episcopacy revived in Scotland | 173 |
| 1662. Act of Uniformity. (Aug. 24) Nonconformists deprived . | 166 |
| 1663. Convocation grants subsidy for the last time | 8 |
| 1664 and 1670. Conventicle Act forbids Nonconformist meetings | 167 |
| 1665. Five Mile Act forbids Ministers settling near towns . . . | 167 |
| „ Great Plague in London | 169 |
| 1666. Great Fire of London (September 2-6) | 170 |
| „ Irish Act of Uniformity | 178 |

| A.D. | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 1668. Failure of Comprehension Scheme | 168 |
| 1670 & 1678. Secret Treaties between Charles I. and France | 175 |
| 1672. Duke of York received into Church of Rome | 174 |
| 1673. The Test Act passed to exclude Romanists from office | 174 |
| 1675. Rebuilding of St. Paul's Cathedral commenced | 173 |
| 1677. Mary, Duke of York's daughter, marries Prince of Orange | 175 |
| 1678. The Popish Plots.—Harsh treatment of Romanists | 175 |
| " Act disabling Romanists from sitting in Parliament | 175 |
| 1679. Scotch Puritans murder Archbishop Sharp | 173 |
| 1680. Failure of attempt to exclude Duke of York from Throne | 176 |
| " Commons refusing to vote subsidies, Parliament is dissolved | 176 |
| 1681. Charles proposes Prince of Orange as Regent to James | 176 |
| " King of France subsidises Charles II. | 177 |
| 1685-1688. James II. | |
| 1685. The new King promises to maintain the National Church | 179 |
| " Richard Baxter's trial before Judge Jeffries | 180 |
| " Revocation of Edict of Nantes | 183 |
| 1686. Judges decide in favour of "Dispensing Power" (June) | 181 |
| " Court of High Commission re-established (July) | 181 |
| " Chapels Royal opened for Romanist worship | 181 |
| " Massey, a Romanist, made dean of Christchurch, Oxford | 182 |
| " Camp formed at Hounslow to overawe London | 189 |
| 1687. Revived High Commission attacks the Universities | 183 |
| " (April) Declaration of Indulgence published | 184 |
| " Fellows of Magdalen College replaced by Romanists | 183 |
| 1688. (May 4) James I. orders clergy to read Declaration on May 20 | 184 |
| " (May 18) Seven Bishops petition against it | 185 |
| " (June 8) The seven Bishops sent to the Tower for libel | 186 |
| " (June 30) Trial and acquittal of the seven Bishops | 187 |
| " (June 30) Prince of Orange invited to England | 189 |
| " (Sep. 30) William of Orange issues his Declaration | 189 |
| " (October) New Commission dissolved, Romanists removed from Privy Council, and Fellows restored to Magdalen | 189 |
| " (Nov. 5) William, Prince of Orange, lands at Torbay | 190 |
| " (Dec. 19) William arrives in London | 191 |
| " (Dec. 23) James II. leaves England | 191 |
| 1689. (Jan. 22) Declaration of Right | 191 |
| " Seven Bishops and 400 clergy refuse Allegiance to William | 192 |
| 1689-1702. William III. (and Mary). | |
| 1689. The Toleration Act passed | 197 |
| " (Oct.) Throne barred to Romanists by new Bill of Rights | 195 |
| " Attempt to remodel the Liturgy by Parliament averted | 197 |
| 1697. Choir of St. Paul's Cathedral opened for Worship | 208 |
| 1691. Battle of the Boyne | 191 |
| 1698. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, founded | 198 |
| 1701. Act of Settlement receives the Royal Assent | 196 |
| " Society for Propagating the Gospel, founded | 201 |

| A.D. | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 1702-14. Queen Anne. | |
| 1702. Scotch Parliament re-establishes Presbyterianism . . . | 202 |
| 1704. Queen Anne restores First-fruits to the Church . . . | 204 |
| 1707. Unitarians become a distinct body | 216 |
| „ Union of England and Scotland | 204 |
| 1710. Sacheverell's impeachment | 205 |
| „ St. Paul's Cathedral completed | 208 |
| 1711. Occasional Conformity forbidden by Statute | 209 |
| 1714. Schism Act forbade unlicensed Nonconformists Schools . . . | 209 |
| 1714-27. George I. | |
| 1717. Bishop Hoadley's writings considered by Convocation . . . | 212 |
| „ Convocation silenced by Annual Prorogation until 1850 . . . | 213 |
| 1719. 'Occasional Conformity' and 'Schism' Acts repealed . . . | 209 |
| 1722. Parliamentary grants to English Dissenters | 229 |
| 1727-60. George II. | |
| 1728. Act of Indemnity (annual) relieves Dissenters from certain provisions of Test and Corporation Acts | 231 |
| 1736. Bishop Butler's <i>Analogy</i> published | 217 |
| 1739. Wesley develops his Society | 223 |
| 1760-1830. George III. | |
| 1760. Methodists begin to administer Sacraments | 223 |
| 1776. The historian Gibbon attacks Christianity | 217 |
| 1778. Sir George Saville passes Romanist Relief Bill | 233 |
| 1779. Dissenting Ministers and Schoolmasters relieved from subscription to XXXIX. Articles | 231 |
| 1780. Lord George Gordon "No Popery" riots | 234 |
| 1781. Lady Huntingdon's Connexion registered | 222 |
| 1783. American Independence acknowledged by England . . . | 268 |
| 1784. Consecration of Bishop Seabury for America | 269 |
| 1787 & 1789. 'Test' and 'Corporation' Acts Repeal Bill rejected . | 231 |
| „ First Colonial Bishop Consecrated | 270 |
| 1789. The French Revolution | 217 |
| 1793. Bishopric of Quebec founded | 270 |
| „ Wilberforce attempts to promote Christian teaching in India . | 227 |
| 1795. The Wesleyan Schism. | 225 |
| 1799. Religious Tract Society founded | 228 |
| 1800. Church Missionary Society founded | 228 |
| 1801. Union of England and Ireland (Nations and Churches) . . | 238 |
| 1804. British and Foreign Bible Society founded | 228 |
| 1807. Wilberforce passes Slave Trade Abolition Bill | 226 |
| 1811. National Society founded | 255 |
| 1812. Dissenting Ministers relieved from further penalties . . . | 232 |
| 1813. Unitarians relieved from some of their disabilities . . . | 232 |
| 1814. First Bishop of Calcutta | 271 |
| 1815. Battle of Waterloo | 229 |
| 1817. Romanists admitted into Army and Navy | 234 |
| 1818. Parliamentary grant of £1,000,000 towards new churches. . | 229 |

| A.D. | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 1818. Church Building Society founded | 230 |
| 1820-1830 George IV. | |
| 1824. Parliamentary grant of £500,000 for Church Building | 229 |
| 1827. The <i>Christian Year</i> published | 252 |
| 1828. Test and Corporation Acts repealed | 232 |
| 1829. Romanist Relief Bill passed. It was rejected in 1825 | 234 |
| 1830-1837. William IV. | |
| 1831. Foundation of King's College, London | 261 |
| 1832. Commission appointed to inquire into Church revenues | 241 |
| „ University of Durham founded | 261 |
| 1833. Quakers, &c., allowed to substitute Affirmation for Oath | 236 |
| „ Jewish Relief Bill rejected by Lords (also in 1848 & 1853) | 237 |
| „ Irish Church Temporalities Act. 10 Bishoprics suppressed | 238 |
| „ £1,000,000 lent to Irish Clergy in lieu of tithe arrears | 239 |
| „ Compensation of £20,000,000 to Colonial slave owners | 227 |
| „ Parliament granted £20,000 yearly for Elementary Education | 255 |
| „ Tractarian Movement began | 252 |
| 1834. Rejection of Bill to relieve Bishops from legislative and judicial functions | 243 |
| 1836. Ecclesiastical Commission permanently Incorporated. | 241 |
| „ Tithe Commutation Bill passed (6 and 7, Wm. IV., c. 71) | 242 |
| „ Nonconformists allowed to have marriages in chapels | 232 |
| „ Diocese of Bristol suppressed and Diocese of Ripon founded | 272 |
| „ First Bishop for Australia consecrated | 271 |
| 1837. Accession of Queen Victoria. | |
| 1839. Elementary Education Commission appointed | 255 |
| 1840. Church Discipline Act passed (3 and 4 Vict., c. 86) | 245 |
| 1843. Secession from the Presbyterian Church of Scotland | 204 |
| 1844. Liberation Society founded | 232 |
| 1845. Maynooth Grant permanently established | 239 |
| „ (Oct.) Dr. Newman joins the Romanists | 253 |
| 1847. Opposition against amalgamation of Welsh dioceses | 273 |
| „ Diocese of Manchester founded | 273 |
| „ (Nov.) Rothschild not allowed to sit in Parliament | 237 |
| 1849. The Gorham Case, involving Doctrines on Baptism | 246 |
| 1850. Papal Bull creates Romanist Episcopate in England | 235 |
| 1851. Parliament declares Papal Bull void (Act repealed 1871) | 235 |
| 1852. Convocation resumes its functions, and makes an energetic protest against the new papal hierarchy | 247 |
| 1856. The Denison Case involving Doctrines on Eucharist | 244 |
| „ Irish Church Disestablishment Bill rejected 163 to 93 | 239 |
| 1858. Bill abolishing Church Rates rejected—also in 1860 | 232 |
| „ Jewish disabilities removed 143 to 97 | 237 |
| „ Government of India transferred to the Crown | 237 |
| 1859. English Church Union founded | 244 |
| 1860. Church Defence Institution founded | 243 |
| 1861. Church Rates Abolition Bill rejected by Speaker's vote | 233 |

| A.D. | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 1861. First Church Congress, henceforward held annually | 248 |
| 1864. First Diocesan Conference. Held at Ely | 248 |
| „ Convocation condemns <i>Essays and Reviews</i> | 247 |
| 1865. The Church Association founded | 244 |
| 1866. Convocation condemns Dr. Colenso's writings | 248 |
| 1867. First Pan-Anglican Synod. 76 Bishops present | 282 |
| „ The Mackonochie Case, involving Ritual observances | 245 |
| 1868. Church Rates Abolition Bill passed | 235 |
| 1869. Irish Church Disestablishment Act passed | 239 |
| „ Vatican Council promulgates new doctrines | 236 |
| 1870. Elementary Education Act passed | 255 |
| „ The first Suffragan Bishop of modern times consecrated | 281 |
| 1871. University Tests abolished | 233 |
| „ Commons refuse to Disestablish English Church, 374—89 | 243 |
| „ Martyrdom of Bishop Patteson in Melanesia | 250 |
| 1872. Commons refuse to Disestablish English Church, 356—61 | 243 |
| 1874. Public Worship Regulation Act passed | 245 |
| 1875. The case of Clifton, v. Ridsdale | 246 |
| 1877. Diocese of Truro founded | 274 |
| 1878. Diocese of St. Albans founded | 275 |
| „ Second Pan-Anglican Synod (100 Bishops present) | 283 |
| 1880. Diocese of Liverpool founded | 276 |
| „ Burial Laws Amendment Act passed | 233 |
| 1881. Revised Version of New Testament published | 116 |
| 1882. Diocese of Newcastle founded | 277 |
| 1884. Diocese of Southwell founded | 279 |
| 1885. Revised Version of Old Testament published | 116 |
| „ Mr. Bradlaugh allowed to take his seat in Parliament | 239 |
| „ Martyrdom of Bishop Hannington at Busoga | 251 |
| 1886. House of Laymen met for the first time | 248 |
| 1888. Diocese of Wakefield founded | 280 |
| „ Oaths Abolition Bill passed the Commons | 240 |
| „ Third Pan-Anglican Synod (145 Bishops present) | 284 |



GENERAL INDEX.

An asterisk () denotes that an illustration will be found on the page indicated.*

A

Abbot, Archbishop, 112, 119, 127
Abhorrence, Declaration of, 190
 Absolution, doctrine of, exaggerated, 14
 Acts of Parliament. See *Statutes*
 African Missions, 223, 250
 A'Laseo, John, 69—71
 Albemarle, Duke of, and the Plague, 170
 Alienation of Parochial Tithes, 52,
et seq; 239, 241, 242
 Allen, Cardinal, 94
 Alexander VI. Pope, 15—20
 Altars, removed by Ridley, 71; replaced
 by Laud, 120, 129
 American Episcopate, The, 202, 268—270
 Anabaptism, growth of, 165
 Anabaptist-, burnt, 69
 Andrews, Bishop, 120—122
 Annates, *see* First Fruits
 Anne of Bohemia, 10
 Anne, Queen, 196, 204, *et seq*
 Anti-papal, Statutes, 8—10, 29—34, 82,
 96, 98, 101, 174, 175, 181, 235
 Apathy of Georgian Era, 214 *et seq*
 Appeals to Rome forbidden, 93
 Aquinas, St. Thomas, writings of, 76
 Architecture, Church, Tudor, 103;
 Wren's revived Classic, 172
 Armada, defeat of the, 99—102
 Armagh Cathedral, view of choir, 258*
 Arminianism, 119 and *note*
 Armourer, An, 4*
 Articles, The Six, 41, 63, 73
 Articles, *The Forty-two*, 90
 Articles, *The Ten*, 40
 Articles, *The Thirteen*, 90
 Articles, *The Thirty-nine*, 90, 95, 98,
 166, prefatory declaration, 124—5,
 Nonconformist subscription to, 231
 Asaph, St., Cathedral, desecration of, 151
 Asaph, St., See of, attempt to amalga-
 mate it with See of Bangor, 273
 Assembly, General, of Scotland, 131—132
 Association, The Church, 244, 245
 Atheist Disabilities, removal of, 239—241
 Attainder, Bill of, against Strafford,
 133; against Laud, 140

Augmentation, Court of, 47
 Augustinian Monasteries, suppressed by
 Wolsey, 25; by Henry VIII., 42 *et seq*
 Augsburg, Confession of, 90
 Austin Friars Church, London, 69, 95*
 Australian Episcopate, The, 271
Auto-da-fé, meaning of, 76 *note*
 Azincourt, battle of, 3*, 7

B

Babington Conspiracy, 98
 Baillie, Robert, and Independents, 141
 Bancroft, Archbishop, 112
 Bangorian Controversy, 213
 Baptism of Adults, Service for, 165
 Barlow, Bishop, 69, 80, 87—89
 Bartholomew, St., Massacre of, 94—95
 Basle, Council of, 11
 Battlefield Church, Shrewsbury, 19*
 Baxter, Richard, 163, 165, 180*, 186
 Beauchamp Chantry, 13*
 Becket's Tomb, 21, 48
 Bemerton Church, 135; view of, 136*
 Benedictine Monasteries 25, 42, *et seq*
 Benedictine Nun, Dress of, 43*
 Berkeley, Bishop, 215; 216
 Beverley Minster, view of, 58*
 Bible, The, Wycliffe's translation, 5, 7,
 12, 37; Tyndall's translation, 37—39;
 Convocation pleads for re-translation,
 37; Coverdale's translation, 38; Mat-
 thew's translation, *ib*; the Great
 Bible *ib*; public reading of, *ib**; the
 Geneva, 91; Parker's *ib*; author-
 ized version of, 115—117; Revised
 Version of, 116; translated into Irish,
 178; other languages, 199, 228
 Bible Society, British and Foreign, 228
 Bishops, appointment of by *congé d'elire*
 68, 74, 83. The Edwardian, 68, 69;
 the Marian, 72—74; the Elizabethan,
 85—89; opposition to by Puritans,
 108—110; expelled from Parliament
 138, 139; restored, 162; in America,
 268—270; in the Colonies, 270—271;
 modern increase of, 272—281; gather-
 ings of at Lambeth, 282—285

Bishops, The Seven, 185—189
 Bishops, The nonjuring, 191, 192
 Bohler, Peter, 221
 Boleyn, Anne, Queen, 27, 28, 33, 71
 Bonner, Bp., 62, 63, 68, 72, 75*, 77, 78, 86
 Bosworth Field, Battle of, 19
 Bouchier, Cardinal, 20
 Bouchier, Joan, burnt, 69
 Boyle, Hon. Robert, 200
 Boyne, Battle of, 191*, 192
 Brallaugh, Mr. Charles, 240
 Bray Church, 193*
 Bray, Dr. Thomas, 199; in Maryland, 201; his 'Associates' 201
 Breda, Declaration of, 161
Breviary, The, 39; see Prayer-book
 Bristol Cathedral, view of, 272*
 Bristol, See of, 54, 55, 272
 Browne, Rev. Robert, 95
 Bucer, Martin, 70, 81
 Bulls, Papal, meaning of, 9 *note*. is used against Chichele, 9; forbidden by Statute, 34, published in England notwithstanding 93, 235
 Bunyan, John, account of, 168
 Burials Bill, 1880, 233
 Burnet, Bishop, 197, 204, 206, 210
 Burleigh, Lord, 82 *et seq*
 Burton, Dr., 129, 133
 Butler, Bishop, 216*; his 'Analogy,' 217

C

Calcutta. See of, 250; 251
 Calvin, John, 36
 Calvinism, 94, 95, 109, 124, 125
 Calvinistic Methodists, 222
 Cambridge, University of, 183, King's College Chapel, 15, 103; Queen's College, 16; Trinity College, 59—60; St. Mary's Church, 71*
 Canons Ecclesiastical (1603), 111, *note*
 Cape Town, Synod of, deposes and excommunicates Dr. Colenso, 248.
 Carlisle, Diocese of, 54
 Carthusian Monasteries, 43 *et seq*
 Carthusian Monk, Dress of, 49*
 Cartwright, Dr. Thomas, 96
 Catechism, The Church, 111
 Catechisms, Presbyterian, 141
 Catharine of Aragon, Queen, 27—29, 33
 Cathedrals, of 'old foundation,' 56; of 'new foundation,' 57
 Cavaliers, 134 *et seq.*, 163
 Caxton, William, 17
 Chalice, withheld from laity, 13; restored by Convocation, 66
 Chantries, profusion of, in 15th cent. 14; suppression of, 63—65
 Chapels, Dissenting, marriages in, 232; exempt from taxation, 232

Charles I. King, 122—146
 Charles II. King, 147—150, 161—177
 Charterhouse School, 60, 61
 Chester Cathedral, nave, 55*
 Chester, See of, founded, 54, 55
 Chichele, Archbishop 3, 7, 9, 16
 Chichester Cathedral defaced, 151
 Christchurch, Oxford, 23, 55, 182*
 Christian Knowledge Society, 197—202
 Christmas Day forbidden, 141, 159—160
 Christ's Hospital, 65*
 Church Building, *temp.* Q. Anne, 208; George III. 229; modern 262*
 Church Building Society, 229, 262
 Church Congresses, 249
 Church Courts, corruption of mediæval, 20; marriage questions settled in, 28; recent prosecutions in, 244—246
 Church Defence Institution, 243
 Church House, 248
 Church of England, The, aim of, 40.
 The middle position occupied by, 136, 194; National character of, 264, 286
 Church of Ireland, 178, 238
 Church of Scotland, see Scotland
 Church Missionary Society, 228, 229
 Church Rates, 232, 233
 Church Restoration, 257—259*
 Cistercian Monasteries, 43 *et seq*
 City Road Chapel, Wesley's, 225
 Civil Wars, The, 134, 135, 142—3, 149
 Clement VI., Pope, 112
 Clergy, celibacy of, 6, 41, 69, 74; taxation of, 8; 'Submission of,' 31—32, 34; the Long Parliament and the, 135; sufferings of under Puritans, 156—158; character of in 18th century, 214—215; modern increase of, 260; educational institutions for, 261
 Clifton v. Ridsdale, Case of, 246
 Cluniac Monasteries, 25, 42, *et seq*
 Coal Dues, 172, 208
 Colenso, Dr. T., writings of, 248
 Colet, John, Dean of St. Paul's, 22—25
 Colleges, suppression of 59—64, Theological, 261
 Collegiate Churches, 58
 Commission, Court of High, 83, 97, 105, 120, 127, 134, 181, 189
 Commons, House of, see Parliament
 Commonwealth, The, 146—161
 Communion Office, First English, 66
 Comprehension Schemes, for including Dissenters within the Church of England, 98, 110, 143, 163, 168, 196, 197, 211; only true basis of, 225, 285
 Conferences, Diocesan, 248
 Congregationalists, see Independents
 Constance, Council of, 10—12
 Continuity of National Church, 2, 103
 Conventicle Act, 167, 232
 Conversion, doctrine of, 221, 226

Convocation, meaning of, 6 *note*, represses Lollardy, 7; rebuked by Colet, 23; the first to suggest reforms and repudiation of papal supremacy, 29—31; nothing done without its sanction, 42, 104, 196 *note*; constitution of, 72—73; revises liturgy, A.D. 1542 1552, 39, 66, 67, 71; A.D. 1662, 165; draws up Canons, 111, 132; declines to promote Comprehension Scheme of William III., 212; refuses to denominate the Church of England as 'Protestant'; silenced through Archbishops Tilotson and Tenison 212—213; revival of, 216—7, useful recent work 247, 248, and *note*

Cosin, Bishop of Durham, 124, 125, 133
Coverdale, Bishop, 38, 51, 68, 80, 87—89
Covenant, Solemn League and, 131; 135; imposed upon clergy, 138—147

Cowper, William, the poet, 219

Cranmer, Archbishop, promotes divorce of Queen Catharine, 29; attempts to Lutherise the Church, 36; welcomes the foreign reformers, 36, 41, 69—71; promotes revision of liturgy, 39, 66 *et seq.*; fails to preserve chantry revenues, 64; advises the burning of two Anabaptists, 69, 70; supports Lady Jane Grey, 73; burnt, 79—80

Cromwell, Oliver, 141—160

Cromwell, Lord Thomas, 32, 50; portrait of, 51*; beheaded, 52

Cross, Cheapside, destruction of, 148*

Curates, meaning of term, 260, *note*; modern increase of, 260, 266, *note*

Curates' Society, The Additional, 260

D

Day, Bishop, deprived, 68

Deaconesses' Homes, 267

Declaration of Indulgence issued by Charles II., 174; and by James II., 183—186; Clergy refuse to read, 185; Seven bishops petition against, *ib.*; enforced by High Commission, 189

Defoe, Daniel, 169, 170, 206; his *Shortest Way with Dissenters*, 209

Deistic Controversy, 216—218

Denison, Archdeacon, 244

Dering, Sir Edward, 137, 138

Dioceses, subdivision of, 54, 272—281

Directory for Public Worship, 140, 158

Disestablishment of Irish Church, 239

Disestablishment of English Church, motions rejected in Parliament, 243

Disestablishment of Church in Wales, proposals for the, 243, 244

Dissenters, *see* Nonconformists

Dissenters' Indemnity Act, 231

Divine Right of Kings, 105, 121, 123

Divorce Oase of Henry VIII. 27—29

Doctrinal Reforms under Henry VIII., 39—40; under Ed. VI., 63—66, 69—71

Dollinger, Dr. von, quoted 89 *note*

Dort, Synod of, 119 *note*

Drake, Sir Francis, 99, 100

Drogheda, O. Cromwell's cruelty at 149

Dunbar, battle of, 149

Dutch Reformers, welcomed by Cranmer 69; extensive immigration of, 94, 95

E

East India Company, 103, 200, 237

East India House, View of, 201*

Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 241, 267

Edinburgh, old St Giles' church, 130*

Education, Elementary, S.P.C.K. provision for, 200; neglect of by the Government, 255; work of National Society, 255—257; in Essex, 256

Edward III., commercial policy of, 3

Edward VI., 42, 61, 62*, 63—72

Eikon Basilike, quoted, 144 *note*

Eliot, St. John, 125—6

Elizabeth, Queen, 74, 75*, 81—103

Elstow Church, view of, 167*

Ely, See of, invaded by papacy, 9

Endowments, parochial, 5, 52—60, 64, 241, 266, 267

Engagement, *The* 147, 160

English Church Union founded, 244

English language, changes in, 17, 116

Episcopate, The Anglican, increased by Henry VIII., 54—56; endangered by Marian bishops and Puritan exiles, 85—87; preserved by consecration of Parker and others, 87, 89; upheld by Charles I., 144; suppressed by Long Parliament, 138 *et seq.*; restored, 182 *et seq.*; recent extension of, 263—267

Epworth Church, Lincolnshire, 220*

Erasmus, 22—24, 35

Erastianism, 64

Essays and Reviews, 247

Et cetera Oath, *The*, 132, 133

Eucharist Controversy, 12—14, 41, 66, 77, 84, 92, 198, 244—246

Eugenius IV., pope, aggression of, 9

Evangelical Party, rise of, 222

Evangelical Revival, *The*, 225—227, 230

Evelyn, John, quoted, 147, 153, 159, 160, 170, 172; portrait of, 159*

Exeter Cathedral, profaned 51—52

Exeter, Synod of, 247

F

Fathers, Early Greek and Latin, writings of, studied at Oxford, 21; ousted by mediaeval writings, 76

Ferrar, Bishop, 69; burnt 78
 Feudalism, 4, 19
 Finance—Recent statistics respecting Church, 266—7
 Fire of London, the Great, 170; view of, 171; * Monument of, 172*
 First Fruits and Annates, seized by Henry VIII., 30; restored by Mary, 74; seized by Elizabeth, 83; made over to Queen Anne's Bounty, 204—205
 Fisher, Bishop, 29—33
 Fisher, the Jesuit Father, 120
 Florence, Council of, 11
 Fox, George, the Quaker, 149
 Foxe, Bishop, 16
 France, Wars with, 2—3
 Franklin, Benjamin, quoted, 222
 Frankfort, Troubles of, 81
 French Revolution, The, 217
 Friars, in rivalry with Monks, 20; anti-national character of, 44; excluded from universities, 60
 Frobisher, the Explorer, 99, 103

G

Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, 62, 63, 68, 72—75*, 77, 78
 Geddes, Jenny, commences riot against the Scotch liturgy, 131
 Genealogy of Plantagenets and Tudors, 104; of Stuarts and Hanoverians, 194
 George I., 213; his reign, 214, *et seq.*
 George III., gives up title 'King of France,' 3; his reign, 225, *et seq.*
 Georgia, the Wesleys in, 220; Whitefield in, 222
 Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, 217
 Gibbons Grinling, the Carver, 173
 Glastonbury, Abbey, 43, 50, 69
 Glencoe, Massacre of, 203
 Gloucester, See of founded, 54—56
 Goldsmith, Oliver, 215, 280
 215; his Vicar of Wakefield, 280
 Gordon, Lord George, riots, 234
 Gorham, Rev. G. O., 246
 Grace, Pilgrimage of, 47
 Gray, poet, his *Elegy*, 215
 Greek, first studied at Oxford, 22
 Grey, Lady Jane, proclaimed Queen, 72
 Grindall, Archbishop, 80, 96 *et seq.*, 127
 Grocyn, the Greek Professor, 22
 Guiana, British, See of, 271
 Gunpowder Treason Plot, 112, 113*

H

Hamilton, Patrick, burnt, 107
 Hampden, John, 126, 127, 126*, 134
 Hampton Court, 26; view of, 110*
 Hampton Court Conference, 110, 111

Hanoverian Dynasty—Table of, 194
 Heath, Archbishop, 68, 73
 Heber, Bishop Reginald, 251*, 252, 270
 Henrietta Maria, 122, 144, 173
 Henry VII., 19—21
 Henry VIII., portrait of, 41*; befriends Oxford Reformers, 23; writes against Luther, 35; his divorce not the cause of the Reformation, 27; marriage with Anne Boleyn, 28; his share in the Reformation, 29 *et seq.*; restores Royal Supremacy, 31; excommunicated by Paul III., 33; promotes translation of the Scriptures, 37
 Herbert, George, 135; quoted, 136—137
 Hereford Cathedral profaned, 150*
 Hoadley, Bishop, writings of, 212, 213
 Holmby (Holdenby) House, 142
 Home Reunion, 225, 285
 Homilies, 1st book of, 63; 2nd book of, 91
 Hook, Dean, 253
 Hooker, Richard, 98; his *Ecclesiastical polity*, *ib.*; influence of, 120, 122
 Hooper, Bishop, 68; portrait of, 78*; obstinacy respecting vestments, 69; imprisoned by Mary, 73; deprived, 74; Martyrdom of, 77—78
 Hospital Sunday, Contributions to, 267
 Hospitallers, Knights, suppression of, 50
 Hough, Dr., President of Magdalen, 183
 Hounslow, camp of James II. at, 189
 Howard, Admiral, 99, 100
 Hudson's Bay Company incorporated, 200
 Huguenots, Massacre of, 194, 195; tolerated, 183; again persecuted, 184, 190; welcomed in England, 184
 Huntingdon, Selina, Countess of, 222
 Hymns, of Cowper, 219; of Charles Wesley, 224; of Heber, 251, 252

I

India, The Church in, 237, 270
 Image worship repudiated by Lollards, 21; enforced by Council of Trent, 92
 Images, destruction of, 62, 82, 137, 148
 Independents, rise of, 95; principles of, 119; opposed to Presbyterians, 141—4
 Indulgences, traffic in, 14—15; sanctioned by Council of Trent, 92
 Infidelity of the 18th century, 216—218
 Injunctions, Royal, of Ed. VI., 63, 89
 Inquisition, The Spanish, 76, 101
 Institutes, Calvin's, publication of, 36
 Institution of a Christian man, 34, 40
 Instrument of Government, The Cromwellian, 154, 156
 Interdict, Papal, against England, 33, 93
 Ireland, Church of, 178, 238
 Itinerating preachers, Wycliffe's 5, 223
 Wesley's, 223—5

J

Jacobites, 192—194, 196
 Jamaica, See of, 271
 James, I., 105, 106, 110—123
 James II., 174, 175, 179—194, 203
 Jeffreys, Judge, 179, 180*, 181
 Jerome of Prague, 11
 Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster, 115*
 Jesuits in England, 81, 94, 96, 112, 181
 Jewel, Bishop, 80; his *Apology*, 91
 Jewish Disabilities, removal of, 236, 237
 Julius II. Pope, appoints a child to Scottish Primacy, 107
 Jurisdiction, Episcopal, 30; derived from the Crown, 34 and *note*
 Juxon, Archbishop, 144, 162

K

Keble, Rev. John, 252, 253*
 Kelso Abbey, View of, 108*
 Kemp, Cardinal, 20
 Ken, Bishop, 177, 179, 185, 188*, 192
 King's College Chapel, Cambridge, 15*
 King's College, London, founded 261*
 Kirkby Lonsdale, Tithes of, 60
 Knox, John, 81, 107—109

L

Laity, sufferings of, under Commonwealth, 158—160
 Lake, Bishop, 184, 188*
 Lambeth Articles, 93
 Lambeth Conferences, 282—285
 Lambeth Palace, 40, 153, 284*
 Latimer, Bishop, 41, 63, 73, 79*
 Latitudinarianism, 212 *et seq*
 Laud, Archbishop, 112, early career of, 120; portrait of, 121*; administration of, 127, *et seq.*; enforces Liturgy on Scotland, 130—131; imprisonment of, 133; trial and death of, 138—140
 Law Courts, view of the new, 246*
 Law, Wm., 214; his *Serious Call*, 215, 219
 Lectionary, revised by Convocation, 166
 Legate, Bartholomew, burnt, 119
 Leicester Abbey Ruins, 26*
 Leighton, Dr. Alexander, 128, 133
 Leo X. Pope, 15, 20
 Levellers, suppressed by Cromwell, 147
 Lichfield Cathedral, profaned 152
 Liddell, Rev. R., Prosecution of, 244
 Litany, First English, 39; revised, 84
 Liturgy, 66 *note*; see Prayer-book
 Liverpool Cathedral, view of, 276*
 Liverpool, Diocese of, founded 275—277
 Lloyd, Bishop, 184, 188*
 Lollard Prison, Lambeth, view of, 7*
 Lollards, connexion of with Wycliffe, 5;

religious opinions of, 6; statutes against 6—8; assailed by Convocation, 7
 Lords, House of, Bishops in, 46 *note*; expelled from, 138; restored to, 162; Oliver Cromwell's *pseudo*, 155; (*see* Parliament)
 Louis XIV., 175, 177
 Luther, Martin, 35*; his books, 36
 Lutterworth, Bridge at, view of, 11*

M

Mackonochie, Rev. A. H., 245
 Madagascar, See of, 271
 Magdalen College, Oxford, privileges assailed by James II., 183; restored, 189; view of Tower, 190*
 Mainwaring, Bishop, 123, 124
 'Malignants,' 137, 138, 157
 Manchester, Cathedral, view of, 273*
 Manchester, See of, 273—4
 Manners, Societies for Reforming 199
 Manning, Cardinal, 253
 Mansfield, Judge and the Romanists, 234
 Marlborough, Duke of, 205, 206
 Marriage, sanctity of, violated by Church of Rome, 27; the Lambeth Conference on, 285; in Dissenting Chapels, 232
 Martin, Marprelate Libels, 97
 Martin V., Pope, resistance to, 9
 Martyr, Henry, Indian Missionary, 227
 Martyr, Peter, 70; his wife 81
 Mary, the Blessed Virgin, worship of 21
 Mary I., Queen, 72—81
 Mary II., 175, 176, 183, 191, 192
 Mary, Queen of Scots, 93, 98, 99*
 Maryland, 230; Dr. Bray in, 201
 Mass, the, 14; see Eucharist Controversy
 Massey, Dean of Christchurch, 182
 Maynooth, Romanist College at, 239
 Methodism, account of, 223—226
 Millenary Petition, Tbe, 110
 Ministers (monastic churches); made cathedral, 54—56; made collegiate, 56—58; made parochial, 58—59
 Church His. 4
 Missal, meaning of, 14; the book, 39, 66
 Missionary Work abroad, 198—202, 228, 229, 249, *et seq.*, 268, 271
 Mission Chapel, view of, a, 265*
 Missions, Home, 260, 264—266
 Monarchy, absolute, 105, 127, 133; destroyed by Cromwell, 142 *et seq*
 revived, 174; limited, 175
 Monasteries, English, abuses in, 24, 44, *et seq*; character of, 44, 45; dissolution of, 46, *et seq*; distribution of estates, 52 *et seq*
 Monasteries, Scotch, suppressed, 108
 Monk, General, 160—162
 Monks, excluded from universities, 60

Moravians, 220—221
 More, Sir Thomas, 22, 23, 26, 32*, 33
 Morton, Cardinal, 20
 Mountague, Bishop, 122, 124

N

Nantes, Edict of, 183, 184
 Naseby, battle of, 142
 National Church, the English, limited authority of, 34; self-reformed, 30; statistics of, 266; great usefulness of, 264—286
National Church, The, quoted, 249
 National Churches, their right to self-government, 35
 National Schools, 255—257
 National Society, 230, 255—257
 Naylor, James, fanaticism of, 149
 Nelson, Robert, 199
 Newcastle Cathedral, view of, 273*
 Newcastle, Diocese of, 277—8
 Newfoundland, 202; the see of, 270
 Newman, Cardinal, 253
 Newstead Abbey, Ruins, 53*
 Newton, Rev. John, 219, 226
 New Zealand Missions, 228; See of, 271
 Nonconformists (*see* Puritans), 166—168; persecuted by James II., 180; their sympathy with the Seven Bishops, 186; tolerated under Wm. III., 196, 197; hardships of, under Q. Anne, 208; removal of their disabilities, 231, their opposition to Romanism, 233
 Nonjurors, *The*, 191—193
 Non-resistance, doctrine of, 183; modified, 192; Oath of, 167
 Norwich Cathedral, profaned, 151
 Nova Scotia, See of, 270

O

Oates, Titus, 175, 176, 179, 180
 Oath of Allegiance, 192 *et seq.*
 Oath of Supremacy, 33, 85, *et al.*
 Oaths, Abolition of, 240
 Occasional Conformity Bill, 208—209
 Oglethorpe, Bishop, crowns Elizabeth, 82
 Oldcastle, Sir John, burnt, 8
 Olney Church, Bucks, 218*
 Orange, Prince of; *see* William III.
 Orange Lodges, formation of, 238
 Ordinal, *The*, English, 68, 85, 83 and *note*
Ornaments Rubrics, *The*, 84
 Oxford Cathedral, 55, 182*
 Oxford Reformers, *The*, 21—24
 Oxford, See of, founded, 54, 55

P

Paine, Thomas, writings of, 218

Paley's *Evidences of Christianity*, 218
 Papal Hierarchy, the modern, 234—236
 Papal Supremacy, repudiation of, 8—10, 25; restoration in part by Mary, 76, 81; again repudiated, 82, 92, 93, 99
 Palmer, Rev. William, 253
 Parker, Archbishop, tutor of Princess Elizabeth, 72; directs Reformation settlement, 82—83; portrait of, 88*: election to primacy, 87; his consecration, 87—89 *note*, and frontispiece*: issues translation of the Bible, 91; tomb of, rifled by Puritans, 153
 Parker, Bishop of Oxford, 183, 184
 Parliament, Commons represented in, 4; petitioned by Lollards, 6; attempts to confiscate Church property, 7; passes anti-papal statutes, 8; upholds national independence, 9; supports Convocation in repudiating papal supremacy, 29 *et seq.*; restrains Queen Mary, 74; conflict with Charles I., 123 *et seq.*; proceedings of the Long, 132 *et seq.*; proceedings of the Rump, 146 *et seq.*; dissolved by Cromwell, 153, 155*; the Barebones, 154; Cromwell's, 154—156; dissolution of the Long, 161; the Cavalier, 163 *et seq.*; does not legislate on spiritual questions independently of Convocation, 42, 104, 196 *note*, 241. (*See* Statutes.)
 Parliamentary Grants to the Church and Dissent, 229, 230
 Parochial System, advantages of, 263—6
 Passive Obedience, doctrine of, 105; accentuated, 123; modified, 189, 192
 Patteson, Bishop, his missionary station, 249*; his work and martyrdom, 250
 Paul IV., Pope, insults Elizabeth, 82
 Pecoek, Bishop, quoted, 12, 13, 21
 Pennsylvania founded, 149, 182, 201
 Percival, Rev. W. F., 253
 Perth, Riots at, 107; five articles of, 115; the old church of, 203*
 Peterborough Cathedral, view of, 28*
 Peterborough, see of, founded, 54—56
 Petre, Father, the Jesuit, 182
 Pews in Churches, 210, 211*
 Philip of Spain, 74—77, 81, 99
 Philpotts, Bishop, defends his vote on the Reform Bill, 243; resists appointment of Mr. Gorham, 246—7
 Pisa, Council of, 10
 Pius IV., Pope, his famous creed of Trent, 92; offers to sanction Reformation if he may be supreme, 93
 Pius V., excommunicates Elizabeth, 93
 Plague in London, the Great, 162*, 170
 Pocock, Rev. E., and Puritans, 157
 Pole, Cardinal, 76, 80, 81
 Pollanus, of Strasburg, 69

Pontefract Church, destruction of, 152*
Pontifical, The, 39, 68
 Popes, Rival, 10
 Porteus, Bishop, of London, 226, 254
 Potter, Archbishop, on infidelity, 217
Præmunire, statute of, enforced, 8, 10;
 opposed by popes, 9; Wolsey prosecuted under, 27; clergy threatened with, 30—31; Mary I. threatens to use, 81
 Prague, University of, 10, 22
 Prayer Book, Sources of the, 39; revision of by Convocation, 40; First Book of Edward VI., 66; objections to, 67; Second Book of Edward VI., 71; suppressed by Mary, 74; restored by Elizabeth, 83—85; revised at Hampton Court Conference, 110; public use forbidden, 140; private use forbidden 157, 159; restored, 162, 163; again revised, 166; occasional services, 114, 146
 Presbyterians, Rise of, in Scotland, 106—109, 202—204; in England, 96, 110, 117, *et seq.*; repressed by James, II., 180
 Prerogative. Royal, restored, 34; strained by Charles I., 123 *et seq.*; and by James I., 121 *et seq.*; limited 195; infringed by Pope Pius IX., 235
 Press, Censorship of the, 197
 Pretender, The, 190, 191, 213
 Pride, Colonel, 144—146, 161
 Priories, alien, 15
 Printing, invented, 16—18
 Privy Council, Judicial Committee 245
 Propagation of the Gospel, Society for, founded, 200—202; its work, 250, *et al.*
'Prophecysings', 96, and *note*
 Provisors, Statute of, re-enacted, 8;
 Bp. Pocock prosecuted under, 12, *note*
 Prynne, William, 129, 133, 139
 Public Worship Regulation Act, 245, 246
 Puritans, meaning of term, 94, *note*;
 troublesome to Archbishop Parker, 95;
 upheld by Archbishop Grindall, 96;
 repressed by Whitgift, 97; executed for sedition, 101; at Hampton Court, 110—112; emigration of, 117—119;
 costumes of, 118*; opposed to Laudian party, 121—123; opposed to Charles I. in Parliament, 123 *et seq.*; repressed by Laud, 127 *et seq.*; in the ascendant, 132 *et seq.*; persecute Episcopalians, 135 *et seq.*; divisions among, 141; intruded upon the benefices, 104—107, 156 *et seq.*; expelled from benefices after Restoration, 166;
 repressive legislation against, 166—168; *see* Nonconformists.
 Purchas, Rev. John, case of, 245
 Purgatory, doctrine of, 13, 92
 Pusey, The Rev. Dr. E. B., 253
 Pym, John, 125, 133, 134

Q

Quakers, account of, 148; repressed by Puritans, 149; and by Churchmen, 162; allowed to affirm, 197
 Quebec, See of, founded, 270*
 Queen Anne's Bounty, 204—205

R

Raikes, Mr., founds Sunday-schools, 254
 Rectorial Tithes, 60. *See* Tithes.
 Recusants, meaning of term, 112 and *note*
 Reformation, The, meaning of term, 1, 2;
 great need of, 19—21; sought after by Lollards, 6; by Council of Constance, 10; by Oxford Reformers, 23; by Wolsey, 25; by Convocation, 29 *et seq.*; not the work of Hen. VIII. or Parliament 29—31, 47; reaction against, 40, 41; Thos. Cromwell's share in, 51; progress of under Ed. VI., 62 *et seq.*; opposition to under Mary, 72—81; settlement under of Elizabeth, 82—91
 Reform Bill of 1832, 241, 243, 272
 Reformers, Foreign, come to England. 36; their influence, 69—71
Regium Donum, of George I., 229
 Religious Houses, *see* Monasteries
 Religious Tract Society founded, 228
 Religious Societies, 18th cent., 197,
Remonstrance against prelacy 124
 Remonstrance, The Grand, 134
 Restoration, The, 161; profligacy of, 162
 Revenues, Church, attacked by Parliament, A.D. 1404. 7, 10; by 'Barebones' Parliament, 154; reported on by Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 241, 266—7
 Revolution, The, 189 *et seq.*
 Ridley, Bishop, 63, 66, 68, 71, 73, 79*
 Ridsdale, Rev. Charles, case of, 246
Right, Declaration of, 191
Right, Petition of, 124; violated by those who framed it, 156
Rights, Bill of, 191, 195, 196
 Ripon, See of, founded, 272
 Rochester, See of, rearrangement of, 275
 Rogers, Canon, Martyrdom of, 77—78
 Romanist Disabilities removed, 233, 234
 Romanists, the first English, 93, 94;
 bishops in partibus for, 121; excluded from the Throne, 195—6
 Romanism, National dread of, 173 *et seq.* 234—236
 Rome, Church of, the National Church of Italy, 109, 120; historically Apostolic, 109, 120; no jurisdiction in England 10, *et al.*; erroneous, 92, 234
 Rome, City of, 239*; St. Peter's at, 15
 Rose, Hugh James, 253

Roses, wars of the, 13, 19
 Rubrics, Royal Commission on, 245
 Rupert's Land, See of 270
 Rye House Plot, 177
 Ryswick, Peace of, 196

S

Sacheverell, impeachment of, 205—206
 Sacrilege, doom of, 54; under Ed. VI., 64, 65; under Commonwealth, 143—153; proposed by Liberationists, 253—259
 Saint Albans, See of, founded, 275
 St. Asaph, See of, preserved, 273
 St. Bees' Theological College, 261
 St. Frideswide, Shrine of, 55
 St. Mary at Walsingham, Shrine, 21, 43
 St. Oswald, Church of at Chester, 55
 St. Paul's Cathedral, restored by Land, 170; burnt in Fire of London, 171; rebuilt by Wren, 173, 208; completed, 208; view of, 207*; cost of, 208
 St. Paul's School, founded by Colet, 23
 Saints, worship of, 21, see images
 St. Werburgh, Benedictine Abbey of, 55
 Sancroft, Archbishop, 177, 184, 185,* 192
 Sarum Liturgy, The, 39
 Saunders, Rev. L., martyrdom of, 77—78
 Saville, Sir G., and the Romanist, 233
 Savoy Conference, 163—165
 Savoy Palace, view of, 164*
 Savonarola, an account of, 20
 Sawtry, William, burnt at Smithfield, 6
 Schism Act, The, 209
 Schools, Charity, and the S.P.C.K., 200
 Scory, Bishop, 68, 80, 87—89
 Scotch Episcopacy, suppressed, 103; revived 114; again revived 173
 Scotch Liturgy, 129, 130; opposed, 131
 Scotland, Church of, 106—8, 173, 202—4
 Scotland, union with England, 204
 Seabury, Bishop, account of, 263, 269
 Seculars and Regulars, rivalry of, 20
 Self-denying Ordinance, 142
 Selwyn, Bishop, 250; 271
 Servetus, burnt by Calvin, 36
 Service-books, see Prayer-book
 Sharp, Archbishop, of St. Andrews, 173
 Shaxton, Bishop, 41
 Sheldon, Bp. at Savoy Conference, 164
 Sherlock, Wm. Master of the Temple, 193
 Ship Tax, 126, 127; abolished, 134
 Ships of war, *temp.*, Armada, 100*
 Sibthorpe, Dr., on 'passive obedience,' 123
 Sierra Leone, See of, 271
 Sixtus V., Pope, sanctions Spanish Invasion of England, 99
 Smithfield, Burnings at, 6, 8, 69, 77, 119
 Soldier, costume of Puritan, 142*
 Southwell Cathedral, 51, 57*;
 Southwell, See of, founded, 279

Sports, Book of, 119, 128 and *note*, 129
 Stafford, Lord, Trial and Death of, 176
 Star Chamber, view of, 128*
 Star Chamber Court, 96, 127, 134, 139
 STATUTES relating to Religion and the National Church. *De Heretico Comburendo* 6; see Anti-papal; 6 Articles, 41, 63; Acts of Uniformity, Edward VI., 67, 71; repealed by Mary, 76
 Elizabeth, 83—85, 95; James I., 111; Charles II., 165—66; Root and Branch Bill, 133; see Test Act; Perpetuation (of the Rump) Bill, 153; Indemnity Act, 162; Conventicle Act, 167; Five Mile Act, 167; Exclusion of James II. Bill, 176; Act of Settlement, 196; Occasional Conformity Bill, 208—209; Schism Act, 209; Test and Corporation Acts Repeal Bill, 232; Romanist Relief Bill, 234; Dissenting Chapels Marriages Act, 232; Tithe Commutation Act, 242; Jewish Relief Bill, 236—237; Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, 235; Church Rates Abolition Bill, 233; Irish Church Disestablishment Bill, 239; Elementary Education Act, 255; University Tests Abolition Bill, 233; New Bishoprics Bills, 274, 276; Oaths Abolition Bills, 240.

STATISTICS of Modern Church Work, S.P.C.K., 200; S.P.G., 202; O.M.S., 223; Sunday Schools, 254; National Society, 255—6; Increase of Clergy, 260—1; Church Building, 262—4; Parochial Agencies, 266; Voluntary Contributions of Churchfolk, 267. American Church, 270; Colonies, 270—271
 Stoke Pogis Church, view of, 214*
 Strafford, Earl of, 126, 127, 132—133, 143
 Stratford-on-Avon Church, 102*
 Succession, 'The Protestant,' 195—196
 Sunday Observance, 123 *note*
 Supremacy, Royal, upheld in 15th cent., 9; surrendered by Henry VII., 19; revived by Henry VIII., 31 *et seq.*; interpretation of by clergy, 32 and *note*; resisted by Bishop Fisher and Sir Thos. More, 33; and by foreign monasteries, 44—45; surrendered in part by Mary, 76, 81; regained 82

T

Tables, Communion, see Altars
 Tasmania, See of, 271
 Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, 157, 158, 219
 Taylor, Dr. Rowland, martyred 77—78
 Templars, Knights, suppression of, 45
 Temple Church, view of, 97*
 Tenison, Archbishop, 201; claims the right to prorogue Convocation, 212

Test Acts, against Romanists, Elizabeth's, 98; Charles II.'s, 174; made more stringent, 175; failure of James II. to repeal, 181; provisions of, 208
 Test and Corporation Acts Repeal of, 231
 Tetzel's Traffic in indulgences, 39
 Tewkesbury Abbey, 59*
 Tillotson, Archbishop, 212
 Tintern Abbey Ruins, 45*
 Tithes, alienation of, 52, 60; defined, 60, *note*; Irish, 238, 239; administered by Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 241; commutation of in 1836, 242; estimated present value of, 266
 Toleration Act, The, 196—197, 231, 232
 Tonstal, Bishop, 62, 68, 69, 72, 75*, 85
 Tories, meaning of term, 175 *note*
 Tower of London, The, view of, 185*
 Tractarian Movement, 244, 252—253
 Traitor's Gate, view of, 186*
 Transubstantiation, denied by Lollards, 12; repudiated by 'Ten Articles', 40; restored by 'Six Articles', 41; test of heresy, 77; affirmed by Council of Trent, 92; condemned by Test Act, 174
 Travancore and Cochin, *see* of, 270
 Travers, Walter, opposed by Hooker, 98
 Trelawney, Bishop, 184—188*
 Trent, Council of, 91—93*
 Triers, Committee of, appointed by Cromwell to expel the clergy, 156
 Truro Cathedral, view of, 274*
 Truro, *See* of, founded, 274—275
 Turner, Bishop, 184, 188*
 Tyndale, William, translates Bible, 37
 Tyrconnel, Lord, 178, 183, 189, 191, 237

U

Uniformity, need of, asserted by Elizabeth, 93; advocated by Laud, 120, *et seq.*; enforced by Puritans, 135, *et seq.*
 Uniformity, Acts of, *see* Statutes
 Union, Act of, with Scotland, 204
 Union of England and Ireland, 239
 Union Jack, the flag, 204
 Unitarians, 216
 Unity of Christendom, 285
 University Tests abolished, 233
 Unrestored Church, An, 259*
 Utopia, Sir T. More's, quoted, 23

V

Van Parre, George, burnt, 70
 Vatican Council, 1869, 236
 Vestments Controversy, 69, 95, 96, 110, 136, 244—246

Vicar-General, title of, 51 and *note*
 Vicarial Tithes, 60
 Virginia, 103, 117, 200, 201, 268
 Visitation of Monasteries, 24, 46, 48
 Visitation, Royal, *temp.* Ed. VI., 63, 67
 Voysey, Bishop of Exeter, 68

W

Wakefield Cathedral, view of, 280*
 Wakefield, *See* of, founded, 280
 Wales, 'disestablishment' in, 243, 244
 Walpole, Sir R., 216, 229
 Warburton, Bishop, 216
 Warham, Archbishop, 21 *et seq.*
 Waterland, Dr. Daniel, 216
 Waterloo, Battle of, 229
 Watson, Bishop, 218
 Watson, Joshua, his work for Church, 230
 Waynflete, Bishop, 16
 Wells Cathedral, Puritan misuse of, 152
 Wesley, Rev. Charles, 212—221, 223, 224
 Wesley, Rev. J., 212—225; portrait, 224*
 Wesleyan Conference, responsible for Methodist Schism, 225
 Wootton v. Liddell, case of, 244—245
 Westminster Abbey, 54
 Westminster Assembly, The, 140—141
 Westminster, *See* of, 54, 280
 Whigs, meaning of term, 175 and *note*
 Whitby, Benedictine Monastery at, 50
 White, Bishop, 184—188*
 Whitefield, George, account of, 221, 222
 Whitehall, *temp.* Charles II., 177
 Whitgift, Archbishop, 97, 91, 111, 112
 Wilberforce, William, 226, 227*
 William III., 175, 176, 189—204, 208, 231
 William IV., 194, 232
 Williams, Archbishop of York, 119
 Winchester Cathedral profaned, 150
 Wittenberg, Confession of, 90
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 22—25*, 26, 29
 Worcester, battle of, 149—150
 Wren, Sir Christopher, 172, 173, 208, 210
 Wyatt, Sir Thomas, rebellion of, 74
 Wyeliffe, John de, 5—12, 223

Y

York Convocation, *see* Convocation
 York, Elizabeth of, weds Henry VII., 19
 York v. Lancaster, Wars of, 18—19
 York, St. Mary's Abbey at, 60

Z

Zenana, Missions in the East, 229
 Zuingli, Ulrich, the Swiss Reformer, 36



HEcE
L

Lane, Charles Arthur

Illustrated notes on English church history.
v.2.

614259

DATE

NAME OF BORROWER

University of Toronto Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

